LIBRARY

ONTARIO

DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Vault 27-B

PUBLISHERS OF LAW BOOKS
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS
The Carswell Company
LIMITED

ONTARIO

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

of the

2nd Session of The 23rd Legislature

of The Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1950, ET SEQ.

VOL. 3

Volume 16

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS NINTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P.M.

Toronto, Ontario
Thursday, March 9, 1950
3.00 o'clock, p. m.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Cathcart from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills presents the following as its second report:

To the honourable, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its Second Report:-

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:-

Bill No. 4 - An Act respecting Canada Conference Evangelical Church.

Bill No. 11 - An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children.

Bill No. 18 - An Act respecting the township of Cornwall.

Bill No. 19 - An Act respecting the City of Guelph.

Bill No. 31 - An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 4, An Act respecting Canada Conference Evangelical Church;

Bill No. 11, An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children; and Bill No. 31, An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) Bryan L. Cathcart

Chairman

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with certain matters which might be described as "procedural matters", and also deals with pensions to employees of school boards, along similar lines as those which were included in the High Schools Act and Separate Schools Act, which were presented a few days ago.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Assessment Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, would the

hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) give a brief explanation of the Bill.

MR. DUNBAR: There are a number of amendments to the Act, but there are some new features.

1. To permit the appointment of district assessors in the territorial districts on the request of two-thirds of the municipalities in the district. This authority has been requested time and again by municipal organizations in the districts.

2. The Act is amended to provide that the assessor must visit the property when making his assessment, and provides that the assessor can only request the owner or tenant to complete a questionnaire when he is unable to obtain certain information after two or more visits to the property.

3. There are a few changes in the percentages to be used in arriving at business assessment.

4. There are numerous amendments to assist in the preparation of the assessment roll and the revision thereof.

5. There are numerous amendments to clarify the Act, without change in principle, previous to revision of the Statutes.

These will all go, after receiving second reading, to the Committee on Municipal Law, and will be considered there.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL: (York East): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I want to protest concerning a photograph appearing in the Globe and Mail this morning on the front

page, in which is shown the picture of the two best-dressed men in this Chamber, and I read underneath that there was one Liberal and three Conservatives, but no member of the official Opposition.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): We are the working men.

MISS MACPHAIL: I would say about our own Leader, (Mr. Jolliffe) that at least he has hair on his head, and that is something.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: Now, in regard to the ones they have chosen; I want to make some comment. In my opinion --- and I el in this case I ought to be a good judge -- I do think the most distinguished man opposite is the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: I do not pay so much attention to his clothing, but both his face and his head look good to me. He also has a head of hair.

Then when I turn to page 15, I am fairly dazzled --

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): That is the Federal field.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes, and you cannot talk Federal things in this House.

SOME Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: Surely they would expect the representatives of the people to look well-dressed, but not to look like Eaton's tailors. That is going too far.

One thing I want to make very clear, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be a fair share accorded to all of us. I

feel the official Opposition has been overlooked, and I want to protest.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the remark by the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) which was directed partly to me, but fairly shared with the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) I would like to say that if this were not a tailors' convention, I think the best-dressed woman in this Legislature would be, without any question, the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: If I am taking second place, and the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is taking third place, then I wish to say that the sartorial squalor of the hon. members of the Legislature is beyond all conception.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I want to say something.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: Your own family is the most critical, and my daughter said last night, "I will not say much about your looks, but you have character in your face".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. KENNEDY: That is what I think, after all, is real beauty. So I think my daughter knows more than the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) about what beauty really means, and I will believe her.

Yesterday, I was up at the college, and for the first time they put on a fashion show, where all the girls made their own dresses, and their hats, and I went in, and I sat --

not too far back from the front -- and I saw these girls moving forward and backward, and somebody was explaining the dresses, although I did not understand what they were saying about the "gussets", the "seams", and "three-quarters' length", but it sounded attractive to me, and my oh my, these girls did look attractive. I enjoyed every one of those twenty-one girls, as they moved up and down, backward and forward, showing their own dresses, and I think there was real beauty.

AN hon. MEMBER: You are not so old.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the temptation of drawing the attention of the House to the fact that my man made it. I also want to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the slights shown to this group, my colleague and I desire to give notice of a demand for a recount.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to rise to point out to the hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Porter) a statement made by Magistrate Hanrahan in the city of Windsor this week, in a case involving one Joseph Assef, the case of a professional bootlegger. The statement made by Magistrate Hanrahan was to the effect that the Windsor Police Department had been rendered impotent by this individual.

I think that is a very serious statement to come from a sitting magistrate, and undoubtedly the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) has seen the statement and by now is giving some consideration to it.

But, further than that, I would like to point out, although the hon. Liquor Commissioner (Mr. Welsh) is not in

his place, that the evidence brought out in this case shows that this one Joseph Assef did make deliveries from five thousand four hundred cases of beer, or bottles of whisky, within a sixty-day period in the city of Windsor.

That raises, in my mind, the question as to whether any individual can acquire that amount of beer or liquor under the present regulations of the Liquor Control Act, and if not, then what is the position of the Department of the Attorney General, or of the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) in charge of the enforcement of the Liquor Control Act, and what will be done in respect to those things?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the matter raised by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis); no suggestion has yet been made that the Ontario Provincial Police were being assigned to investigate the Windsor Police Department. That is something which might be taken from the report in the Daily Star, in which it is said that:

> "Mr. J. R. Magone, Deputy Attorney General, said that the provincial police at Windsor had been asked by Queen's Park to make an investigation into the corruption charges made by Magistrate Hanrahan in giving judgment in the bootlegging case."

Mr. Speaker, may I say that we have requested a report, and a copy of the Magistrate's remarks.

I understand, however, that the raid was made by the provincial police, and not by the Windsor police force, and we have asked the Crown Attorney of that district to obtain from his honour, Judge Gordon, the chairman of the police commission, information as to what action they intend to take.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

RESUMED DEBATE ON SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the honourable, the Lieutenant Governor, at the opening of the Session, Mr. Frost.

MR. JAMES S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I should like to add my contribution. First of all, I would like to congratulate the mover, (Mr. Reynolds) and the seconder (Mr. Leger) of this address, and also pay my respects to the only lady hon. member in the House (Miss Macphail). I think she is quite a valuable addition to this Chamber.

I had the pleasure of knowing the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) predecessor, and I am sure he was known as the "grand old man of this House", and he was, what we used to call, "a gentleman and a scholar".

I would like also to compliment the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Leger), as he represents a ridiing in which I was a pioneer quite a long time ago. My father and I went up to that country some forty years ago, and started to clear out the bush, and we did not have very much assistance in doing that, either.

I have seen a great deal of progress in the north country in the last forty years, and I would like to see the government give more assistance to some of the settlers in that part of the country, because I feel there is a great future there, perhaps greater than the people in the south realize.

A great deal of progress has been made in the last forty years. In those days we did not have the roads we have today, but thanks to the present government, and governments of the past, we have decent roads up there, as far as Cochrane, and west from Cochrane. I drove over that country last fall, and I could see considerable improvement. Cochrane itself is no farther north than Winnipeg, and as the country is opened up, there will be a change in climatic conditions. There is no reason why they have not room up there for a large number of people, and I do want to see some of these settlers coming into that country.

One of the things which holds them back is that people come up from places like Toronto and attempt to farm, while they do not know anything about farming. In order to be a farmer, you have to know something about it.

I understand that some of the Dutch people want to get up there, and I think there should be a modified way of helping them along. I do not believe in giving them money to throw around, but if we could have a board up there to see that they were spending their money on the farms, I think we would reap great benefits in the end.

One of the other things about which I would like to speak, a matter which is important not only to the province of Ontario, but elsewhere in Canada. It is rather a serious matter, and I do want to congratulate the government on its road program, which will improve conditions a great deal.

Another things I would like to mention is this; I do not know whether you have noticed it or not, but in coming up to this building, I have noticed on this job by the city of Toronto, I will wager at least forty per cent of the total

employed on that job come from the American side, and I am told some of them are getting as high as a thousand dollars a month, and I understand some of them are objecting to the income tax requirements. They are not key men. It is all right to move in a few key men, but it is not necessary to bring in foremen on construction. Surely this country of ours can furnish enough foremen. It is not necessary to bring in men to operate steamshovels; it is not necessary to bring in men who are welders; it is not necessary to bring in men to do a lot of work that is being done down there.

I do not say it is our business, as the government, here, to say anything about it, but I wanted to advise the hon. members of this House.

I am a working man myself, and I came up the hard way. I picked the stones at an early age on the farm; I lived on a homestead in Weyburn, Saskatchewan, when I was sixteen years of age, I worked down through that country, and I finished up shovelling coal into a locomotive in Montana, before I came back home. My heart and soul are with the working people, and I feel that you cannot intelligently speak about labour, unless you know something about it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEMPSEY: I think the good mayor of the city of Toronto -- and I think you have a splendid mayor -- has the responsibility of looking into the matter ans seeing if Canadian workmen cannot be employed on these jobs.

I understand that some engaged in clerical work have been replaced by people from the American side. I am sure we must have somebody in Canada who can keep time and keep books. They would not require my services, because I did

not spend much time at school, but I think very easily somebody could be found, and I think we should draw the line there.

It has been said that we are short of coal. I have burned some of the coal which came from our sister province of Alberta, and it was good coal. Maybe it was not packed up the same as some of the other coal, but it was good coal, and I cannot understand when the Federal government owns the railroad, why we should have a coal shortage, when there are lots of men out of work, and lots of coal in Alberta, and a great deal of coal in New Brunswick, and those men now out of work could be put to work digging coal, instead of having them on relief.

Another thing about which I wish to speak is Hydro. I have worked for the Hydro as a foreman thirty years ago, and I do not think there is anybody who has been more in touch with Hydro than myself. I worked for Hydro in different capacities, at first doing small jobs, like hauling in freight, with a wagon, to one of their projects. That was more than thirty years ago. I put the first steel line across the country, and delivered this steel between Peterborough and Packenham, and I do not think there is anybody better able to speak about Hydro than myself.

I do want to assure the hon. members of this House, that there are most capable men in their building down there, men more capable than any other place in Canada. I have seen them, and I know. I have been around construction jobs a great deal. There are a number of men there, but there is one whom I would like to mention. Nobody seems to know what they do exactly, but I can assure you they all take an interest in their work. There is one man who started on the job more than thirty years ago, David Forgan, a man who is

so interested in his work that he has not had time for anything else. I can speak about "Lord" Mitchell, and about Otto Holden. Mr. Holden certainly has a good head on his shoulders, and I understand he is a lawyer, but in addition to that, he is also a good business man.

We are getting hydro down in my country, and that is the main thing that concerns us.

May I saw a few words now, Mr. Speaker, about the progress that is being made in my riding. My success here depends upon the way I serve my riding, and I feel definitely that I am only a servant of the people down there, and if I can serve them well, I am satisfied.

I do want to commend our hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) because in the last few years we are getting roads down there, and we want to be on the map the same as other people, We also are getting hydro, and now we are even beginning to look like other people down there.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEMPSEY: Before leaving the subject of Hydro, I want to mention the man at the head, "Bob"Saunders, a man who has, and owing to his efforts, we are now beginning to have good hydro service in my county.

We want some forestry work down there. If there is going to be a depression, as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) seemed to predict, there is plenty of opportunity in Renfrew county. Forty per cent of the county is owned by the province of Ontario. Renfrew county is a big county, and I understand over a million acres is owned by the province. We should have more nurseries down there. I was hoping we would get one this year, and get the young trees planted

because we have a lot of good land in Renfrew county, and specially along the Ottawa River, We raise a lot of good cattle, and everything else down there, and we have a large lumber section down there, and I do hope we will soon get around to the point where we will get a nursery started, and get to planting trees. There is a campaign on to plant trees. In fact, I think we are getting the schools interested in that, which would not be a hard thing to do, and we could easily give them a hundred acres of land, and have the "kids" get busy and interested in planting trees, and come back in forty or fifty years, and see how they have grown.

I do not want to take up any more time, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). He seems to be a very congenial man, and he is also a "gentleman and a scholar".

I also have a very high regard for the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEMPSEY: He seems to belong to the people, the same as our present Premier (Mr. Frost):

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEMPSEY: Now, we have our two hon. friends over there, supposed to be Communists, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). I do not think they are Communists at all. They are very likeable fellows, and I think they should be wooed over to one of the political parties, where they could be of great service. They sit back there in their places, and all that seems to be wrong with them is that their minds seems to be running in the wrong channel --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEMPSEY: They are personal friends of mine. I have spoken to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), and the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and they are indeed very likeable. They are splendid "guys", only for that one terrible thing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEMPSEY: My grandmother was one of those old United Empire Loyalists, who came here in her bare feet, about one hundred and fifty years ago, and they got along very well. I sort of like this old province of Ontario, and in fact all of Canada, and I do not like to see anybody who does not; in fact, I believe both of these hon. members (Mr. MacLeod and Mr. Salsberg) should have a change of heart, and the amount of good they can do will be good for us, and good for all Canada.

I do not think I will take up any more time, now, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of things about which I could speak, but I was brought up as a boy, in surroundings where you were supposed "to be seen and not heard". You were not supposed to open your mouths, and there are a number here who will do the talking, so much so, that many of us do not get the opportunity of getting up and expressing an opinion, so I sort of follow the general rule of letting the other fellows do the talking.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, may I open my remarks this afternoon by extending my congratulations, adding mine to those already extended to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) on his elevation to the high office he now occupies in the province. He is the best-looking man in the House,

as the lady hon. member (Miss Macphail) has already said.

It is a great honour and a wonderful privilege for a man to be named as the head of a province the size of Ontario, and I do extend my sincere congratulations to him, upon that accomplishment.

I feel there is a tremendous difference between his style, and the style of his predecessor. It is something like comparing a bulldozer and a Packard sedan. The other fellow made a lot of noise, but he had a lot of power. The present hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is a lot more silent, but I think the power is there, too.

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Funny how he wins his re-elections.

AN hon. MEMBER: What happened to him in the last one?

MR. DUNBAR: He got in all right.

MR. ROBINSON: I would like to congratulate the mover, (Mr. Reynolds, and the second (Mr. Leger) for their moving and seconding the address in reply to the Speech from the Thone. They made their maiden addresses, and they performed their allotted tasks exceptionally well.

Through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to extend to the Speaker of the House my congratulations for the very capable manner in which he conducts the affairs of his office. He has a style which permits a certain amount of levity, but he still maintains the dignity of the House.

There are so many things about which I want to speak, that I hardly know where to start, because I do not want to take up too much time. When I get to Toronto, my mind does not seem to work as well as it does up north in the great open spaces. I feel that I am shut in, and I would like to

suggest we move the capital city of this province up to the head of the lakes, up to my part of the province. I am sure it would suit all hon. members of the Legislature, because they all expressed delight after having paid us a visit up in the northern part of the province.

I want to congratulate the government on making that trip to the north and north west possible, and I think the main credit for that must be given to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) whom I believe engineered the whole affair. I think from the debates I have listened to since coming down to this Session in the House, there is every indication of what the hon. members learned while on that trip. They went all over that country, and observed our natural resources, of every kind, and have seen what has been taking place.

I would want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I hope the next time the hon. members come up to our part of the province, they will have time to stay with us a little longer, and we would be pleased indeed at any time, in the city of Port Arthur, to play host to them, and see that they get around and see the things they wish to see or should see.

I would like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, about what I would call the "missing link". I do not mean by that the pre-historic men at all. But I mean that famous piece of highway which is in there between Sault Ste. Marie and the lake head. I have always felt when I make a trip across the line into the United States, that our good friends to the south of us are much more aware of the importance of this great stretch of road than we are in the province. Perhaps we are too close to it to really realize that it is a piece of road

which cannot be classed with what you might call "ordinary roads". It is an extraordinary piece of road, not yet completed, but when completed, it will be in category by itself, as a scenic highway in northern Ontario. I cannot for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, understand why we have not long ago made a real drive to complete this piece of highway, and our American friends are completely at a loss to understand it, and I venture to say if that piece of highway was located in the United States, it would have been completed long ago. Early this year and late last year, when word came out that the Federal and the provincial governments were getting together to build the highway, we in the north west corner of the province felt that at long last, that piece of road would be completed, and I was delighted last week to see a big headline in Port Arthur newspaper announcing that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) favoured the lakeshore route, and it only remained for him to convince the Cabinet. I want to congratulate him sincerely, and hope that he succeeds in convincing his fellow members of the Cabinet that this is the route that should be followed.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Did he actually say that?

MR. ROBINSON: The press said he said it, and gave him two-inch headlines. There is nothing he could say which will be more welcome in my part of the province. But since then, I have been worrying a little, when I see it has been said that the road may come as a piecemeal project over a period of years. I wish to make a real plea to the government, that this road be not built in that manner, Of course, it would be better to have it piecemeal than not at all,

but it would be very helpful if the two levels of government could get together, and push this through and complete it, because then we would have the outstanding scenic highway on the North American continent, which would attract more tourists than any other project which could be completed, for scenic beauty, for the possibilities of development, for the tourist attractions, for recreation, for defence; no matter which way you look at it, it is an outstanding, badly needed piece of road in this province. It would soon become known as Canada's tourists favourite tour, and I want to congratulate my colleague, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) on the grand job he did when he made his remarks the other day. He, like myself, spoke about that piece of road. See the possibility of the tourist business running into the hundreds of thousands, by completing that piece of road,tourists,who,when they come into Canada, when that road is completed, will be able to drive around the shores of Lake Superior.

(Take B follows)

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it deserves a much better fate than piecemeal construction over a period of years, when it would be dry, and eventually we would have to wait for many years to see it.

If it is a question of financing, I feel sure it would be possible to make a bond issue, and we certainly could sell them. There are so many people interested in that road, that the people would be willing to invest -- people who are willing to invest in a war bond would certainly invest in bonds for a useful thing such as that highway. And the American people would be interested themselves.

I would urge the Government to float a bond issue, if necessary, similar to the Victory Loan bonds; the bonds could be sold in Canada and the United States, and we could drive this unique highway through to completion.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a very dark secret concerning the route of a trans-Canada highway across Ontario. I would say if we do not build that highway with the combined finances of the government, we will miss the boat, and we will have to wait for years to come to complete it. Highway No. 11 across the northern part of the province is very important, and has played an important part, and is playing an important part in the development of northwestern Ontario. It has been, and will continue to be, a great influence in the northwestern corner. I would like to see that road developed and improved, and I think branch roads should be pushed out to connect up with other points; one of the points is Nakina, which only needs a short piece of road to get to Highway No. 11, and it would be most welcome to have that constructed.

It would also be welcome for Geraldton, which would derive some business that would be possible in that area.

I would also ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to consider taking over the existing road on the west side of Lake Nipigon and complete it through to Armstrong. Other development roads are badly needed.

I could say, Mr. Speaker, a great deal more about roads, but I will cover some other subjects now.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Government on their decision to build a mental hospital in Port Arthur. That is an excellent site, right in the main section of the city, which is needed for an institution of that kind. It is a site that provides isolation with accessability.

Last year the City of Port Arthur built a mile of new pavement connecting this site with the main section of the city. This institution, when completed, will avoid what has happened in the past, where citizens had to be sent hundreds of miles up to Eastern Ontario for treatment. When that institution is completed, that situation will be ended, and it will not be necessary to send these patients so many hundreds of miles where, in some cases, the patients had to await disposition of their cases in our jail.

I sincerely hope the Government intends, and will, push ahead with the construction of this institution. I might add, Mr. Minister, that this is an excellent time of year to clear the land, and we could put some of our unemployed veterans to work on this if the hon. Minister

(Mr. Kelley) gives the nod.

Another institution which has a great future in northwestern Ontario is the Northwestern College of Arts and Sciences, formerly known as the Lakehead Technical Institute. This organization has in recent months shown real signs of expansion, and will be of great value to all in northwestern Ontario and in all sections of Canada when it is concluded.

When the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) was Mayor of the City of Port Arthur, and I was a member of the Board of Education, the City of Port Arthur set aside a most beautiful site which will some day, I hope, house the University of Northwestern Ontario. This institution is presently housed in temporary quarters, and it is gaining steadily, and I sincerely hope to see the day that we will have a University of Northwestern Ontario which will serve all that area, both in the east and west. I sincerely hope that the first buildings can go up on the site in the not too distant future.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, proudly, that I was a promoter for a Junior College in our part of the province when I was almost alone in these feeling. As time went on, Toronto was interested in the scheme, that it was worthy of careful consideration, and after looking at it, they set up the Lakehead Technical Institute, and some further thought will have to be given.

We have a live-wire committee working at the Lakehead today striving to aid in the everyday activities and pushing towards the final goal. I know the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is watching developments

closely and we appreciate that fact.

I would like to speak of a proposal that Mr. Drew made at the Lakehead in August, 1946. Speaking at the Lakehead, he felt there should be constructed "as soon as possible" Provincial Government building. These buildings would house provincial departments which would be manned by men of senior rank. That is worthy, and it would break the 1,000 mile gap between northwestern Ontario and this part of the province. He qualified this by saying,"when materials and supplies would permit".

At the present, Mr. Speaker, I may say that the Board of Education of Port Arthur is grappling with the problems of overcrowding in our Collegiates and Technical Schools. It is quite possible, Mr.Speaker, that the ultimate solution will be a complete school. The Institute is presently located in the park, which does not lend itself to a school. The present Collegiate Institute would fill the bill admirably as the proposed Government Building. It is built on attractive lines of grey limestone and located on a beautiful site in Waverly Park, right in the heart of the city. It would be much more fitting as a government building than it is as a school, and I put this forward for the consideration for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett), and perhaps we could work out a deal with him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning the question of welfare. I have here the figures for Port Arthur for 1949, and for the month of January, 1950.

The municipal contribution on relief on 1949 was $25,690.83. The main point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make, is the comparison of January, 1949, with January,1950.

In 1949, the city paid out $932.15. In 1950, Port Arthur paid out $2,524.95. That is an increase of over four times, and I would urge the Government to notice this trend. When we are faced with figures of this type, we are always confronted with the same story -- that it is a seasonal slump, seasonal unemployment. Seasonal or not, the municipality bears the"shot", especially the "shot" for unemployed employables. The municipalities are on the ground, right there, and cannot "pass the buck".

The province says it is up to the federal government, and the federal government says it is up to provincial government, and vice versa. I would like to quote some letters addressed to our municipality in answer to those that we sent out to both governments. The first letter is from the Department of Public Welfare of Ontario, and I would like to read the outstanding paragraph:

> "As you will recall, the position of the Provincial Government, as stated by the Minister and the Premier, is that assistance for unemployed employable persons is a matter to be solved by the Federal Government."

That letter, Mr. Speaker, is signed "B. W. Heise, Deputy Minister".

The next letter is one from the federal authorities, dated January 9th, 1950, and there is a paragraph there I should like to read. It says:

> "At the last conference of the Government with the Provinces, there were proposals discussed whereby the Dominion Government

"would assume responsibility for employable unemployed. You know the conference broke up without agreement being reached so that the proposal respecting this issue was not accepted. The idea that the province has now no responsibility is simply not the fact."

I read these two letters, Mr. Speaker, to show what the municipalities are up against. We approach the municipal government and they refer us to the federal government, and the federal government in turn refers us to the provincial government. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we are called upon to take care of hundreds of unemployed employables. The fact remains that the municipalities are carrying the load.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that both levels of government can advance good arguments in support of their stand. However, we in the municipalities have an even better argument, but it does not do us much good. The municipalities are paying the "shot". We do not get a choice.

Until this question can be finally solved and a permanent framework established, I would suggest that the provincial and federal governments should each bear 25 percent. cost of the relief to unemployed employables, with the municipalities bearing the other 50 percent. I do not propose this as a permanent solution, but it would do much to relieve the burden on municipalities until a final solution is found. It would give the municipality a chance to set up their budget and see how much it would cost to operate the city. It is no solution to call the unemployment "seasonal". It is there. It has to be met.

In an effort to meet this seasonal slump bugbear, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, a program, especially planned to meet each local situation, and that it be planned in advance by representatives of the three levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, every municipality has some projects which fit nicely into the seasonal period if some form of additional financial assistance can be supplied. Some financial assistance should be advanced to aid the cities.

I suggest, Mr.Speaker, a scheme of this kind would result in worthwhile projects being constructed; every municipality inOntario has some scheme or project for advancement, and this would result in worthwhile projects being constructed and would take up the slack in these seasonal periods of unemployment without tying up the labour at a time when they might be needed on other projects. It would not tie up the men when they are needed for larger projects, and for navigation. Right now, Mr. Speaker, in Port Arthur, there are several projects that could be carried out in this manner if we could be guaranteed some financial assistance. We could straighten out the Nipigon highway, the portion inside Port Arthur, and a number of other projects. If we could get assistance, it could be done when the seasonal unemployment needs something.

Mr. Speaker, I intend now to devote the rest of my remarks this evening to our natural resources. However, before going into that, I wish to say something about Hydro power developments in the Thunder Bay District. On that, to my mind, I may say that there is nothing more tiresome

than "threshing old straw". I have raised as a question the Aguasabon Plant over and over again in this Legislature, dating back to before the plant was built. The recent heavy increase to power users in the Thunder Bay area emphasizes the fact that this plant, costing $12,500,000. is the "nigger in the woodpile". Cost of power to domestic users in Port Arthur is up 32 percent. That increase raises the average monthly from $2.55 to $3.12.

The more I hear about the Aguasabon plant, the more I go into the question, and it becomes more apparent that the interests of the pulp and paper barons were placed above the welfare of the people.

I have heard a lot of quotations, but I say this: no matter how you sharpen your pencil, you still have the Aguasabon in addition to the plant. Mr. Speaker, discussing this question recently, I was astounded to learn that we might be called upon to bear an even further burden in a form of a share of the cost of the Long Lac diversion which supplies the Aguasabon plant. That would, Mr. Speaker, really be adding insult to injury; that would be an insult to Ontario.

Let me tell you what ex-Premier Drew said about this, speaking in the House as a member of the Select Committee in 1941. Ex-Premier Drew said this:

> " 'This is another astonishing transaction. The Pulpwood Supply Company received valuable concessions in the Long Lac area. This is an Ontario company formed for this particular purpose. The Pulpwood Supply Company is owned outright by another company known as the Pulpwood Company, which in turn is owned

'outright by five large American companies using pulpwood. These companies are: Kimberley Clarke Corporation; Meate Corporation of Ohio; Hammermill Paper Company; Wisconsin River Pulp and Paper Company; and Nakoose-Edwards Paper Company.'

"Then ex-Premier Drew goes on to say this:

'The most surprising feature of this contract was the arrangement by the Department of Lands and Forests that a waterway, known as the Long Lac Diversion, would be opened up for the floating of pulpwood. The agreement provided that the company was responsible for the cost of this diversion only up to the sum of $300,000. Up to the time the evidence closed, the government and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission had expended $1,281,522.23 on this diversion'."

I want to labour this question. I would like merely to show you the cost. All I ask is that the figures and facts be prepared in detail, showing, first, what the financial position of the Thunder Bay system would be if Pine Portage had been built instead of the Aguasabon. Secondly, I ask for figures and facts showing what the position would be if the Aguasabon plant were moved from the Thunder Bay district and placed in the northern Ontario property. If we had all these figures in detail we could examine them and go into the question from all angles, from the question of excessive charges -- if we had all these figures I feel we would be in a better position and have a better chance to size up our position now under the

heading of this plant. I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) to supply us with detailed figures on these points.

I will leave that question now, Mr. Speaker. I have no desire to labour upon it. However, in the light of recent heavy increase in the Thunder Bay area, it becomes a most pertinent question.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat my remarks that I made earlier, that in my opinion the trip the hon. members of this House made into northern Ontario really opened up their eyes, and they merely got a quick glance, yet they saw very clearly what is happening to our resources. The north has borne fruit because of the questions asked in the House, and the hon. members have had a chance to observe what is going on.

The Steep Rock story as told by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is well known in my part of the province. Almost every one in the street knows that part of the story. It is just another example of Canadian resources being controlled and exploited by financiers and industrialists from the United States. It is not so much a question of blaming Americans for their long-sightedness, as charging Canada with short-sightedness.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: We have developed a sort of inferiority complex where we fell we cannot stand on our own feet and control our own destiny. It is not a healthy attitude for a young and wealthy country such as ours. We should not have to lean on others. The position as it now is, is not healthy for Canada.

I would now like, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks about the pipeline from Alberta to Superior, Wisconsin. This is a shining example of our tendency to consider the almighty dollar ahead of Canada, and its welfare.

This pipeline was financed on the basis of 35,000 barrels per day, although its capacity, without any increase or pumping station is 70,000 barrels per day. The additional cost of keeping the line on Canadian soil is $10,000,000., plus an annual cost of $400,000. to service the extra pumping needed for an all-Canadian line. We feel these figures are too high, but even on this basis, 10½ cents per barrel of 45 gallons would keep the line in Canada based on 35,000 barrels daily; 5¼ percent. per barrel of 45 gallons, based on the true capacity of the line, 70,000 barrels, is the same.

The Interprovincial Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Imperial Oil figures it at 35,000 barrels, and the real capacity is 70,000 barrels.

We put up a great battle at the Lakehead to keep this line in Canada, and we received support from all sections of Canada. The Americans were not slow to see the possibilities and I quote from the Duluth News Tribune, dated September 21st, 1949:

(Page B-12 follows)

OIL REFINERY CENTER SEEN AT LAKEHEAD

The Canadian oil pipeline project is a challenge for Duluth and Superior to cooperate in selling the Heal of the Lakes to the petroleum industry as a refinery center, William J. Deegan, Jr., Superior city manager, told Duluth Lions yesterday.

Some oil companies already are considering refineries here to process the new, high-quality crude which will be coming into Superior from Canada next year, according to Deegan. He pointed out that the recent devaluation of foreign currency would favor refiningthe Canadian oil in the United States.

SALES JOB NECESSARY

But, Deegan reminded the Lions, pipe is fairly cheap and a sales job by local industrial leaders is necessary to keep the oil here until it is refined. A refining industry provides a very sound basic economy for a city and might just be the "something drastic" that is needed to stop "economic decline in the Twin Ports, he said.

Petroleum requires a lot of invested capital, provides excellent employment, and makes possible a host of auxiliary industries, especially mushrooming plastics manufacturing, the city manager added.

GET REFINERY LAND

The city of Superior already is acquiring additional property sufficient to accommodate a refinery near the proposed Canadian oil tank farm

property and will donate it to any legitimate refiner, according to Deegan. The tank farm site also was made available without cost but Imperial Oil Company, Limited, refuses to accept it as an outright gift, he disclosed.

Imperial, Degan said, plans to begin pumping oil into Superior by next fall, with first water shipments from here expected to start at the beginning of the 1951 navigation season.

Not much natural gas is coming out of the Alberta oil fields so far, it is going west to the Pacific Northwest light metals industry, Deegan reported.

(Page B-14 follows)

I read that, Mr. Speaker, to show how long-sighted the Americans are. They have their eye on the plastic industry in Ontario. The crude oil situation is continually growing and is taking an important part, from the fuel line. I feel that we should keep in Canada industry that belongsto Canada, industries that belong to Canada and let Canadians do their own processing from Canadian oil on Canadian soil.

There has beenmention of this pipeline in this House by several members at this Session, and Mr. Frost said on February 23rd, and I will read the remarks he made. He said this:

> "We would like to see the pipeline go to the lakehead. But, after all, matters referring to the resources of the province of Alberta are things which relate to that province itself, and that province has been negotiating with other provinces and with other states, and we have very serious misgivings inthe matter of interfering with the business of another province."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these remarks create the impression thatthe route and terminus of the pipeline was a matter for the province of Alberta. This is, of course, not correct. The route of the line or whether it is permitted or not to terminate outside of Canada is a matter for the Dominion Government and, inasmuch as the Canadian terminus would have been located in Ontario, I think the government of Ontario should have been vitally concerned withthis question.

Thisprovince is directly affected to say nothing of the great principle involved.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the following paragraph of a letter addressed to me by the hon. C. D. Howe. This is the paragraph:

"The pipeline is a private project, funds for which will be raised partly in Canada and partly in the U. S. In the circumstances, it is difficult for the Government to interfere with private arrangements."

I say, Mr. Speaker, this reflects on my mind the type of thinking that brought us in Canada to where we cannot stand on our own feet.

In contrast to the remarks of Mr. Howe, I wouldlike to read to this House what Mr. Drew, the former Premier had to say, and I quote from Hansard of October 2nd, 1949:

"The Right Hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) has stated, and stated very properly, that we should export our surplus, trading it for what is a deficit. We are a long way yet, a very long way, in spite of the prospects before us, from being in a surplus position in regard to oil. This is our first venture of this sort. We have only begun to realize the potentialities of this vast field. This pipe line is the first that is to bring the oil from this great field to the east. The minister may dismiss the statement that was made, that, if necessary, it is worth an extra $10,000,000 to carry that pipe line through to the lakehead. This country has spent a great deal more than $10,000,000 on things less productive of results for the future of Canada. It is true that it might cost an additional $400,000 per year in servicing charges for the extra pump that would be required because of the additional 120 miles that would be covered in going through to the lakehead instead of Superior.

If that argument is sound, then why did we ever build railroads across Canada? In some places, we could have used the United States lines. We built railway lines

in Canada because we wanted our own transportation system for the opening up of our own areas. In the building of this pipe line we must look not only to the immediate use of the oil, not only to the immediate consuming power of the lakehead area, but also to the future of that whole area from Sault Ste. Marie through to the Manitoba boundary."

(Take C follows)

These are the remarks of George A. Drew, the former Premier of this province, speaking on the pipeline in the House of Commons. Compare these remarks with those of the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Cathcart), speaking in this House last Tuesday, when he said:

> "That it is proper for the pipeline to terminate inthe United States."

All of these thingssimply serve to emphasize the need for Canadians, who are entrusted withour country's welfare, to give heed to the way in which we are handling our natural resources. We cannot build a strong and enduring nation, if we follow this road.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot complete my remarks on the natural resources of this great province of ours without speaking on the biggest asset of all, and that is, our forests. I should like to say that the history of our province reveals that much talking has been done abuut the failure to roperly utilize our forests. The results show that despite the cry to stop, the despoilation went on, until it denuded southern Ontario and is now at work on the north and the northwest.

I will not weary the House with this history. They can get it from the opening pages of the Kennedy report. I will be content to go back to 1941 and quote Mr. George Drew, then the leader of the opposition,in his submission as a member of a Select Committee of this Legislature set up to inquire into the forest situation. In his minority report, Mr. Drew said:

---and he was urging that a Forest Resources Commission be set up:

"We believe this practice should be followed in Ontario and that an Ontario Forest Resources Commission should be set up to exercise full control over the administration, conservation, reforestration, and industrial utilization of our firest resources. We believe this should be organized along similar lines to the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission. It should be the only body having authority to make contracts for timber concessions. Having regard to the fact that public assets worth hundreds of millions of dollars are involved the commission should be completely divorced from politics and placed under the direction of men of the highest type of business ability.

"It should be the duty of this commission not only to administer and protect the present forest resources, but it should also be their duty to lay plans for the future so that the greatest possible amount of employment may be assured for the critical days following the war.

"We believe that by turning over the control of our forest resources to such a commission, many of the questions upon which it is now difficult to reach a decision, will be easily solved. Such a commission would be at all times a fact finding body and its coordination of information would make it possible to reach decisions with a full understanding of vital facts which are not now available."

That, Mr. Speaker, was back in 1941.

In 1943, the Conservatives won the election on a 22-point program, and I would like now to quote point number 7 of those famous 22 points.

Point number 7 reads:

> "Our vast forest resources, which, under proper administration, are capable of creating employment for hundreds of thousands of new workers, will be placed under the control of an Ontario Forest Resources Commission, which will operate under long-term policies, of conservation, re-forestation, and soild control.
>
> "Immediately after its formation, it will review all existing contracts, and will cancel those which have disposed of great areas of forest resources, without proper consideration."

That, Mr. Speaker, is point number 7 of the famous 22 points which, in turn, called for the setting up of the Forest Resources Commission.

Following the election, and the first session of the Legislature in 1944, the Throne speech had this to say:

> "An Ontario Forests Resources Commission will be appointed to assume the responsibility for supervising this great development which is now becoming the largest single source of our provincial income."

That is a quotation from the Throne speech, in the session of 1944.

Later, in the same session, legislation was introduced to permit the establishment of a Forest Resources Commission. The duties and powers of this Commission were designated, and that is the last we ever heard of the Forest Resources Commission.

Then, Mr. Speaker, nothing further happened, and two years went by, and in April 1946 a Royal Commission was appointed to

enquire into the forest question. The report of this Commission was completed inMay 1947, after making an exhaustive study on the ground, and after hearing 142 briefs from people, ranking from expert to laymen.

I want to say to this House that, in my opinion, the Kennedy report met the situation head-on, and offered a solution in keeping with the magnitude of the problem.

This, apparently, was not what the government wanted, so they put the report of the Royal Commission on a shelf, alongside the Guthrie report, in 1943, alongside the minority report by Mr. Drew, and alongside the 22 points, and the legislation of 1944. They put them on the shelf, to gather dust, while we await the resultsof an inventory, slated to end in 1952.

Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make is the people in the forested areas in this province have waited its coming going on for years and years, and we never seem to get any closer to the day when we really will make the big move that is necessary to meet this problem. We seem to be constantly toddling down the road in short, baby steps, instead of taking the strides, which are needed.

The history of this province records that over and over again the people have hoped for some improvement, and they have come almost to the feeling, in regard to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) that:

"Scott fiddled while the forests disappeared."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Plays the pipes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBINSON: I think heis a very lieable fellow. I say I think I can say without creating hard feelings amongst the other hon. members, that I like him better than anybody else. He is easy to talk to, easy to entertain, and always has that nice

flat tie, but, nevertheless, our forest problems are still unanswered.

As tothe heart of the Kennedy report, I wish t say, Mr. Speaker, that the main objective of that report seeks to achieve the goal it is striving for, and that is a workable plan for integrated logging in our province, and any suggestion that the main points of the Kennedy report have been adopted, is far from correct, because if you read the report and read the solution that is laid down and realize that Major-General Kennedy was striving to get at the hear of the problem, you cannot answer that by fooling around the edges.

The report makes it clear that you cannot hope to achieve this, while we leave the control and exploitation of our forests in the hands of three or four companies, who are interested in the pulp and paper business.

This situation was very ably described by the hon.member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) in speaking in this House last Tuesday. It is uppermost in the minds of any persons who have made any really effor to understand with what we are faced here, and it is uppermost in the minds of anybody who realizes what the forests mean to this province, and the position we will be in, if we do not take some real steps to solve our problem and I say, to ign re a solution to that problem, Mr. Speaker, is to ignore the report itself. Of all our natural resources, Mr. Speaker, none offer the tremendous poosibilities which the forests offer. If you take a look at the standing trees, and what they mean to the people, you will understand better. They are the habitat, the home and breeding ground of fish and wild life; they hold the moisture and protect againstrapid run-off, and erosion, and it controls the watersheds, so vital to our hydro.

The standing tree is the foundation of our parks, and the attraction to our recreation seekers, visitors and natives alike.

Trees create and protect the "sportsmen's paradise," we hear so often spoken about.

All of these things and many, many more come from the standing tree, before you cut it down.

The story of what we can obtain from the tree after it is cut down, reads like a story from the Arabian Nights.

The tree has from the earliest history provided our people with homes and fuel,

(Page C-7 follows)

beginning with the log home of our early settlers.

Then came the great lumber industry which played a very important part in the histor, of Canada. Unfortunately, for want of foresight, plus the greed of certain parties, this industry was permitted to denude great sections of our province, and damage was done which will take a century of careful planning to correct. The lumber industry is still one of our greatest, and if given full opportunity,has a great future in our province.

The pages of history then record the appearance and phenomenal growth of the pulp and paper industry. This great industry has made a great contribution to our province. Nevertheless, the pulp and paper group has gained very questionable control over the cream of Ontario's forests.

Mr. Speaker, we would be guilty of a grievous error, if we presumed that we have reached the end of the road for new uses for our forests.

Modern science is showing manking that he has only scratched the surface. I recommend to every hon. member of this House that he read this book by Egan Glesinger, the chief of forest products board of the United Nations. He is one of the world's outstanding foresters, and to read the pages of the book, will give the hon. members of this House some idea of the possibilities of our forests, which reach far beyond the lumber industry, and the pulp and paper industry, as we know it today, and goes into fields, we have never dreamed of before.

There lies ahead of us a field of textiles, plastics, chemicals, drugs, cosmetics, alcohol, and so forth, and all of the great new fields which will spring from those things. Day by day, the scientist is extracting new and greater wonders

from our very best friend, the tree.

One could go on indefinitely outlining and unfolding this story.

The greatest blessing of all, Mr. Speaker, has still to be stated. We can get all of these things out of our forests over and over, in perpetuity, if we learn to give the forests the treatment they deserve.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: That is the only resource which is in that unusual category.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Do not forget agriculture.

MR. ROBINSON: Perhaps I should not class agriculture with mining, and so on. But of all the well known natural resources, the forests have the unique position that they can produce all of these things in perpetuity. The only catch in the situation is they have to be given the opportunity, and it is all very well to sit smugly back and say, "Oh well, we are doing all right." I do not agree with you that you were doing all right in logging industry as it was operated in southern Ontario, where today we have great areas completely swept of trees, and where the great sawmills once stood, are now what you might call "ghost towns", insofar as the forests are concerned.

If we are going to prevent that from spreading to the other parts of our province, it is important that we go ahead and consider solution in keeping with the problem.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we will see the day when we will discontinue using our slowest-growing and most valuable trees, to make a product which is thrown in the wastebasket

or used to wrap the garbage in, the same day that it appears on the market.

If we are to continue our operations, we must eliminate waste in all its forms, not only in the most glaring and obvious forms, but we must channel each specie and type of tree into the field where it serves the people best.

We must obtain stands in our cut-over areas equal to, or better than the species removed. If we are determined to do these things, we cannot leave huge tracts of our forests, the cream of our forests -- in fact, practically all of our forests -- in the hands of a comparatively small group of people interested in the production of a certain product or products.

Mr. Speaker, we will not reach a real solution to this problem by any plan of "swapping" between the operators. The Kennedy Report makes that perfectly clear. I do not pretend to be an expert on forestry, but I am sure I have outlined at least some of the cardinal points which were in the mind of Major General Howard Kennedy, when he recommended suspension of all licenses, agreements, permissions, and permits.

May I quote some of his conclusions. On page 17 of the report, he says this:

"(1) I do not consider that it is, or ever will be, possible to achieve the rational development of forest resources or to maintain our present industries under the existing plan of limit allocation, with the confusing and conflicting agreements and conditions in force.

(2) In view of the varying conditions in existing agreements, it never will be possible to apply any over-riding regulations which would standardize them

to any considerable degree.

(3) It is not possible for either of the contracting parties to fulfil some of the conditions recited.

(4) Most of the agreements are very one-sided and are indicative of extremely keen bargaining. Export agreements are based on an exception to the general law intended to prevent the very practice provided for in the agreements.

(5) "any people on both sides of the international border believe that there are still vast areas of virgin timber awaiting development. I regret to say that the only area in which I found any considerable quantity of mature timber in blocks of considerable extent, outside areas covered by existing licenses and agreements, is in the Patricia region, nooth of the Lac Seul.

Enough timber for perhaps two moderate-size pulp-mills and a few medium-capacity sawmills still remains unleased in that district. (I am presuming the construction of pulp mills by Long Lac Paper Company Limited and Huron Forest Products Corporation in their respective areas.)

(6) I am convinced that unless vigorous remedial measures are soon taken, the lumber industry will continue to diminish in importance to such an extent that before twenty-five years it will be classed as a minor industry, which would be a major tragedy. If this should happen, it will very severely affect every farmer, home-builder, mine, railway or industrial enterprise which uses lumber or timber. A high mortality rate amongst secondary industries dependent upon sawmills

may also be anticipated.

(7) Single purpose operations in our forests should no longer be tolerated. They are a symptom of the absence of co-operative effort between the various groups within the forest industries. The resultant waste is a reproach to all concerned and must be eliminated in any rational development of the forests. The lack of co-operative effort between members of the same group is painfully evident in many cases across the province."

I cite these as some of the outstanding conclusions of Major General Howard Kennedy, which he arrived at, after an exhaustive study of the forests, and after hearing all of the people it was possible to hear in this province, who were interested enough to come forward and lay their views and opinions before the Commission.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the time has come to do something about it. We have had reports; we have had commissions; we have had committees down through the years, and I feel that any suggestion or any further committee or commission would only hear over and over again the same thing which has been placed before the others.

We are here seeking a worthwhile, workable plan for integrated logging.

It was my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to present a brief to the Royal Commission on Forestry in December, 1946. This brief was, of course, presented before the Royal Commission Report was tabled, yet it parallels the Royal Commission Report to a remarkable degree.

The C.C.F. brief and the Royal Commission Report differ in the main, in the machinery for managing and arranging the harvesting in our forest operations.

(Take D follows)

The C.C.F. recommends the setting up of a Forest Resources Commission and the managment and harvesting under Crown organization. The Kennedy Report sets up twelve operating companies to poll the operations of the present operators.

Under the C.C.F. plan, and for that matter, under both plans, it would be necessary to guarantee suitable wood to existing mills throughout the lifetime of the mill.

Under the C.C.F. plan, all types and species of wood will be cut under sound forest practice. Much duplication would be eliminated; trees would be earmarked for production into the product for which they were best suited. Under such a plan, the present saw-log pulpwood dispute would disappear. The important point I want to make is that, under the C.C.F. plan, all actual management and harvesting will be removed from the control of those interested in the trees as as related to some particular interest or industry.

The Kennedy Report predicts an immediate saving of from $6,000,000. to $8,000,000. under his plan. That is an immediate saving through elimination of duplication, et cetera. The possible immediate savings under the C.C.F. plan will equal, if not greater, and the long-term savings much greater. This money should be plowed back into the forest to help finance a sound forest plan.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Would that saving be in labour?

MR. ROBINSON: I beg your pardon?

MR. SCOTT: Would that saving be made through labour?

MR. ROBINSON: The chief saving would be, Mr. Speaker, in the integrated plan on logging, in all possible co-operation and co-ordination between all levels of government, and

between all of the factors which must enter into a sound forest plan, and in my opinion, on a much sounder level than is the case today or would be the case, if I may be excused for saying so, under the Kennedy Plan, because if in some worked-out mill I see the saw-log operators talking with pulp operators, they are ready to tear their hair out, and under the Kennedy Plan we are putting them as directors of the company and saying: "Boys, quit fighting and be nice fellows, and cut these trees the way they should be cut". I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, if that would be a sound arrangement.

In an effort to meet that problem, along with the others, I suggest we remove it from their hands entirely, that we cut our forest and manage them under Crown companies and under Crown management, and then, after the forests are cut, we deliver them or lay them down where they are procurable to those who operate the industry, we in turn, seeing that the proper wood goes to the proper place where it can be manufactured into these products which is best suited to that type and species of tree.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this plan is worthy of careful consideration, and I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) not to shy away from it on the old argument that it is socialism, because I feel it can be applied to our forest in a sound and sensible way, --

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): So can socialism.

MR. ROBINSON: -- and mean just as much to this province as Crown ownership of Hydro means.

Hon. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): It is owned by the Crown.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, public ownership of Hydro, then, if you want to put it that way, or boil it down to municipal

ownership of Hydro, ownership by the people directly, I am talking about.

We have had sufficient time now that the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) should be ready at this Session at least to acquaint the House with the future basic plans of his Department, and what he intends to do to meet this great question and give us the solution in keeping with the problem.

In the years ahead, Mr. Speaker, not only the forest operations, but the forest industries will have to be strategically located and work on an integrated plan, so that wood waste from the sawmill will go direct to the pulp-mill. We must plan to utilize every cubic inch of our useable wood. We must let the immature tree grow to saw-log size, using the sawmill waste for pulping, rather than cutting the immature tree, as is often the case today.

I would urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) that it would be worthwhile for the province to consider taking over a suitable watershed and to set up integrated logging on a broad scale on the plans that have been laid down, to set up pilot plants for experimental purposes, and to combine the work of the sawmill and the pulpmill and other industries, and to study the situation so as to get the most out of the forest and its by-products.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Ontario is in a unique position in the fact we have the greatest forest stands in most of the world. Canada has a chance to lead the world on this question, and I would say to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) that he could be to the

forest of Ontario what Sir. Adam Beck was to the Hydro of Ontario.

AN hon. MEMBER: Sir James P. Whitney, too.

MR. ROBINSON: I know of no resource which means more to this country or one in which there is greater need for reform. We must, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, have a forest pattern in this province of ours with more meaning to it than the "crazy quilt" we have today.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) that he take into consideration some of the things I have said, that they are worthy at least of that, and I would ask him to give us at this Session an insight into what the basic plans are for the Department of Lands and Forests, and what they intend to do in order to accomplish some of the things I have tried to lay before this House today, and I do plead with him not to again get up and tell us that the inventory is still going on and he is still busy counting the trees.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. MR. SCOTT: We are.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present the case for northwestern Ontario, the treasure house of Ontario. I plead that it receive attention and consideration in keeping with the great contribution it is making to Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Page D-5 follows)

Mr. S.L. Hall (Halton): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the Throne Address I do so with considerable pride in the fact that this government has accomplished many things in the best interests of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, variety is the spice of life. I therefore will confine my remarks to fiddling.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of this Assembly to a remark that was made by the hon. member from Grey South (Mr. Oliver), the member in the opposition that plays second fiddle, to the effect that we, as a government, had come to the end of giving grants to municipalities, associations and individuals. I wish to compliment the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) for his change of heart, for you will remember a few years ago the hon. member went far out on the limb because we would not comply with the request of the opposition party whose leader (Mr. MacLeod) plays third fiddle in the opposition.

MR. MILLARD (York West): What fiddle do you play?

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I have placed the hon. leaders of the three opposition parties as first, second and third fiddler, because there is no other term that seems so suitable.

Mr. Speaker, when this debate was opened by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) we were entertained by a barrage of fiddling in which not a note was struck, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member from Grey South (Mr. Oliver), the second fiddler, made the remark that the first fiddler had to just fiddle for he had no notes to strike.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed with interest across the floor of the House that god-mother eye of the hon. member

for East York (Miss MacPhail) keeps on the hon. member (Mr. Oliver), the second fiddler. We have known children to drift away from the parental path on which they were started but when the guardian drifts away I suppose it is quite natural to think that the guardian eye can look back with considerable pride that at least the god-child did not stray from the political path in which he was started.

MR. MILLARD: A profound speech.

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to a remark by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), The hon. member with great pains praised the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for the very efficient manner in which he is carrying out the duties of his high office, comparing the present Prime Minister's actions to those of a former Prime Minister, Col. the Hon. George Drew.

Now, Mr. Fiddler,--

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Fiddler?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HALL: This was just another case of fiddling, because the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) knows that when a new government is formed it takes a leader with ability to form a Cabinet and to lead the government till they are all in a position to handle their own departments. That, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. George Drew was able to accomplish to the fullest, and to prove that statement the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) could not question the ability of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or any member of his Cabinet.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Who is the fifth fiddler now?

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) also made reference to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) and also the hon. member for North Cochrane

(Mr. Leger).

I understood the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) to say that he supposed that some of the Cabinet Ministers had written their addresses for them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would think that it would be quite natural for any mover, or seconder, of the Address from the Throne, to get information from the different departments of the government, for it would be impossible for a new hon. member to have that information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the peculiar point is that after the remarks by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) he was not in a position to find fault with their addresses. I, therefore, wish to tender to the two hon. members, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) and the hon. member for North Cochrane (Mr. Leger), my congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, there is an hon. member in the opposition that I would wish to congratulate on his address, the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman). Whether some individual is getting larger dividends from Steep Rock development than he should I am not debating, but one thing we have to admit he had faith in the project and was willing to invest his money.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other hon. member in the opposition that I should mention, that is the hon. member that just plays third fiddle in the opposition, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). It must be a very awkward position to be placed in the position of third fiddler when No. 1 and 2 fiddlers are not able to strike a note.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad to see so much ability misdirected and only supported by the hon. member from St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg), who carries the resin for the bow of the third fiddler.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you for your patience

and wish you health and strength to carry out the duties of your high office for many years to come.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I would like first to congratule the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne on their addresses. I might say I was in the riding of Leeds last October, and in spite of my presence there, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) is here today.

I was also in the riding of North Cochrane, and I certainly appreciate the efforts the hon. member (Mr. Leger) to make our visit so enjoyable.

I feel very keenly, along with other hon. members of this House, the serious illness of a few hon. members. I did meet the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault) when he was here in the House for one day, and I found in talking to him that he had been in bed for ten months since this honourable Legislature last met. I thought it might be a good gesture on the part of hon. members of this House if we all sent these hon. members a card or a note while the Session is in progress. I believe they would appreciate something like that.

I see the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Hall) has left his seat. I would just like to remind him that the second and third fiddler are just as important as the first fiddler. When I used to play in an orchestra, the orchestra would be no good unless we had the second and third fiddlers and unless they were all in tune, so I think he got a little mixed up in his fiddling.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR GORDON: In the 1948 election, I made several

statements to the effect that the power consumers in Brantford could expect a considerable increase in their Hydro rates. Now, when Mr. Drew was speaking in our city during the election campaign, he took me severely to task for making such statements -- said there was not an atom of truth in what I said, and he went on to say that not only would there be no increase, but instead of cost of power being increased, the cost would be less. That is one of the vote-getting promises that was produced in my riding, so I was not surprised when our Commission recently received this letter from the O. H. E. P. C., dated December 22nd -- it came as a Christmas box.

It says here that bringing into operation new developments and the increased cost of material and labour, our cost of power was increased, and we would have to pass it on to the municipality. It further states that:

> "All Commissions are warned that the new interim rate are much more closely related to actual costs than formerly, therefore refunds should not be anticipated. Bearing this in mind, each municipality should immediately view its local rate".

We have some results of that letter in Brantford, and I find that in 1946, we had a refund of $38,000., and in 1947, we had $40,000. -- those are just round figures -- in 1948, $31,000., but the other day we received, not a refund, but we had to pay an extra $4,800. And at the first meeting of our Commission this year, we had to raise our rates to the consumer 17.7 percent., and to the users of water heaters some 35 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I maintain there should not have been this increased cost of labour and materials, and we would not have had to build these mushroom plants if the program for the extension and building of Hydro projects had been carried out in 1943 and not laid over for two years. This will cost a great sum of money. An engineer to whom I was speaking at the recent O.M.E.A. convention said it would amount to well over $50,000,000.

In Brantford, we have a rather peculiar situation. I do not know whether or not any of the municipalities have had anything similar, but I have been asked by my constituents to bring this to the notice of hon. members of this House. We have one problem I would like to inform the hon. members of this House we consider very serious and about which the people this situation affects are much concerned.

We have in Brantford some 1,000 orphans -- not in the sense that these orphans have no parents -- these are, shall I say, municipal orphans. Some four miles from Brantford is the Brantford Airport, formerly No. 5 Service Flying Training School. The land is leased to the City of Brantford for use as an emergency housing site. There are approximately 1,000 persons in the families now living in Airport apartments, paying rent to the City of Brantford. To all intents and purposes they are Brantford citizens, earning their livelihood in the city and living outside the city's boundaries, only because of the continual housing shortage.

Many of these people have lived in Brantford over 25 years before having to move to the Airport because of the housing shortage. Because they live outside of Brantford,

they are not eligible for the municipal vote in the city, and because they are not assessed as either township property or tenants, they are not eligible for the township of Brantford voter's list, thus they are deprived of municipal franchise. For geographical reasons, the Airport residents are not included in Brantford's official population, and neither are they included in the Township of Brantford's population. They are municipal D.P's. in an island of nowhere, and not even counted in anyone's population, but they come under city by-laws and have no voice in the election of those who make the by-laws, for like residents of the city of Brantford, they are, for instance, liable for dog licenses and the city's dog catcher includes this area in his jurisdiction.

The city has just about exhausted its supply of building lots where new homes can be built, and will continue to have this very serious building shortage for some time.

I have an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Brantford Daily Expositor:

> "Attention has been drawn in the news columns of this paper to the plight (if plight is the right word) of about 1,000 'municipal orphans' residing at the Brantford Airport.
>
> "As is well known these good folk would be living in Brantford if there were any room in Brantford. There being no room, they have to live as close to their work as possible, and the Brantford Airport is closest.
>
> "But this is where red tape rears its ugly head. Because the Airporters live beyond Brantford's geographical limits, they are not

"included in the city's official population of 37,113. Because they live in premises which are leased to the city, they are not assessed in the Township of Brantford.

"It looks as though that story about 'The Man Without a Country' could be revised by giving it a local slant.

"Those on what might thus be called the Airport Island are not totally marooned. While 'displaced persons' of a sort, they have certain services. Also they are allowed to vote -- but here another catch comes in. They are permitted to vote only in federal and provincial elections, not municipal!

"Some years ago an effort was made to have this ridiculous maladjustment corrected. The matter was referred to the Powers That Be in Queen's Park. There was much riffling of the pages of law books, and a good deal of discussion. But sometimes the statutes of Ontario make the laws of the Medes and Persians look like the most impermanent regulations on earth. In this case the fiat went forth that, since they resided in an electoral riding, federal and provincial, the Airport settlers could cast ballots for candidates for the Ontario Legislature or the Dominion House of Commons. But since they did not reside within the boundaries of the municipal corporation of the city of Brantford, they could not vote for mayor, alderman, trustees, on by-laws, referendums,

"plebiscites or any of the other things upon which city dwellers are invited to vote. And because, while actually in the Township, the land whereon they dwell is leased by the city, presumably the Airport people cannot vote in the Township elections either.

"Correction of this silly state of affairs may have been beyond the capacity of the baffled legislators of three years ago, but since then another provincial election has taken place, and in the interval the M.P.P's. should have brightened up sufficiently to be capable of coming through with some simple solution."

Now, I know these people feel very keenly not being able to have a voice in our municipal affairs, and I hope this situation will be given some very careful consideration.

I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Hamilton), on his elevation to Cabinet rank. I know he is sincere in his work, and is doing a good job, sometimes under trying conditions.

We have a new prison farm some six miles from Brantford, Mr. Speaker, and I am interested in the number of ads. appearing in our local paper, wanting guards at this institution. There must be a reason for this turn-over of personnel and, in talking with several of the men who have worked there, I find that these men could not live and keep a home going on the pay they receive. Here is one case for example, and I have this man's case right here: This is a married man with two children. He receives $128.33, plus $15.00 cost of living bonus per month. From

that, $4.00 per month for uniform is deducted; unemployment insurance, medical, income tax and the total amount of cheque was $134.97. Out of this $7.00 was for meals at the institution, leaving $125.97. Now, this does not include transportation. Because this institution is 6 miles from Brantford and no transportation being provided, some of these men try owning a car, and according to the best authority, I find that it costs seven cents a mile to run a car. You will see that after a man has provided for his transportation, he has very little left with which to raise a family. Now, I suggest a man cannot get along on such a salary, and you cannot be expected to get a good type of men for this kind of work, and you certainly cannot get a man who has much above the chin for such a salary. I would suggest that some provision be made, and that these men be paid a living wage.

I was one of the members who took advantage of the opportunity of seeing the North country. I was very impressed with the great development there and the great possibilities for the future. I was greatly interested with such places as Merathon and Terrace Bay.

Marathon is a fine little town, I believe, of some 1,500 population, with fine hotels and splendid homes and recreational facilities, which many of the towns in this part of Ontario would be proud to have. In talking with some of the residents, the only complaint they seem to have was there was no road out of the place and, of course, if there is no road out, there is no road in, and they said, "When you get back to Toronto, see what you can do to get us a road". I think has been done by most hon.

members who have spoken of this trip. The people there really do want a road, and I think it is more important, probably, than the increased roads that are being talked about for this part of Ontario.

Terrace Bay, with its park-like setting, is another thriving community and when you stop to realize these towns have only been in existence some four or five years, it is really remarkable. I was very much interested in the hon. member for Bellwood's (Mr. MacLeod) information about Steep Rock. That is a wonderful development, and while some individuals have made considerable sums of money from it, yet there is a bright side to it, too. I believe that over a million dollars was paid in wages to the men who worked in there last year, and a great deal more than that amount was paid also to the railroad for freight, so it has some redeeming features.

When at Dryden I was taken out to visit one of the camps on a nearby lake. This is owned by a young American who told me he bought the camp for $15,000. He has made many improvements, including an airstrip so airplanes can land on his property, and he has built many cabins and so on, and I think today he has an equity in it of over $85,000. I said to him: "Why is it we Canadians do not see the possibilities and take advantages of such places as this?" He said the reason was that we were too scared to risk our dollars, and that may be the truth -- it may also be true of the Steep Rock development. This man said he was a pipefitter in Chicago and saved a little money and came over here, and now he has an investment of $85,000.

Mr. Speaker, when the margarine Bill was passed at

the last Session, I believe one of the questions was: "How would anyone colour this anemic product if he wanted to?", and it was suggested that colouring could be purchased at the drug store.

(Take E-1 follows)

I believe, Mr. Speaker, if the small amount of color that was asked for, 3.5, had been allowed, we would not have the condition we have today because now we have what I call "ronsonized" margarine. You just press it and squeeze, its lit, and you have margarine, a much richer and more pleasing color than butter at 3.5. I think in passing the Margarine Bill, and allowing the condition to exist, you have defeated the purpose the Bill was intended to obtain, namely the protection of the dairy farmers.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy-Speaker and members of the House, I want to assure you that I rise without much enthusiasm. I would rather do it on another occasion.

However, the members could not agree among themselves to another arrangement so I will try to say the few words that I have to say at this time.

I would ask the Deputy-Speaker to convey to the Speaker my thanks and appreciation for his impartiality, he was not quite as impartial as his Deputy, but I am sure it will be levelled out and both the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker will be at the proper level of impartiality. I wanted to say something nice about my neighbors but they are not here. However, I willsay it anyway. I want to bring homethat I will say behind their backs what I would say in their presence. Since they came into the House they have made not only two good speeches but they proved to be very good neighbors and that is a good sign. Youcan tell a person by his neighborliness and his relationship, and I want to say that they are very good neighbors. We get along very well. It brings to my mind, however, the old truth, you can be so near and yet so far apart, but I promise to do everything I can do to bring them closer. I am sure they will have greater opportunity to contribute to the welfare of the province from our ground than from others and as a neighbor I hope I will

convince them. They will have more chance to speak here than as members of a very large group.

There have been some very good speeches made in the House and there is an advantage as well as a disadvantage at speaking at this late hour in the debate. You have an opportunity of adjusting and sorting outin your mind the subjects and content of the speeches that you have listened to for a coule of weeks.

I am not in a position to speak about the leaders who made the first contribution, except that I would resort to a very brief conversation that I heard on a street car not so long ago that, perhaps, would affect this situation. I was sitting behind two young women on a street car and they were talking. One asked the other about a movie and she said it was very good. And then she was asked about another movie, and she said: "Well, so-so." Then she was asked about another movie and she said: "Well, that is just so," and then she was asked about a fourth movie and she said: "Nutso." In that very brief way I would say, and with the "Nutso" I think we can describe the four speeches of our leaders. I will not try to fit the different "So's" to the different leaders. I will leave that to the members of the press gallery and I think they will fit each "So" to the proper leader who spoke. If they have any difficutly the press gallery will take a poll and they will not be wrong. They are better observers than you think. However, yesterday on the topic of the well dressed man, I think we are entitled to a recount and we are the only ones who can suggest it because we are not involved. The pressing of my trousers has nothing to do with the choice they had to make.

In regard to the main contribution, when you get commercial, there is a lot of contradiction and conflict in what has been said. Let me strike a few examplesof different contributions. You know that the Federal leadership plays it up very much, and

you have this contribution that the Conservative government minimizes it and plays it down.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): We swept the country.

MR. SALSBERG: And there is a contradiction from my own friends from the centre. Some of them, not all of them, speak on behalf of the Marshall Plan and cry because we have not enough trade fromBritain. That is a contradiction. You cannot have both the Marshall Plan and freedom to trade.

That is an opinion shared by many people in the centre, too, I am very glad to say.

You have a situation here which is rather surprising. This House adopted a Bill, known as Bill number 36, and there was a word said about it by anyone. That is an historic piece of legislation adopted here. I mean when this province agreed to discontinuance of appeal tothe Privy Council and the governmenteventually voted to forget the decisions that their predecessors took on this question. I do not say they took a wrong stand, but it is an historic step they have taken. There was not one remark.

Years ago there would have been general elections on this. Twenty-five years ago on Bill number 36 there would have been a protest meeting. Passions would have run high. Here it went through in routine fashion.

And we go so far as to have proposals from the Conservative side for printing of red money. I want to ask the hon. member (Mr. Cathcart whether he thought it was the right time or whether he should wait.

These things are very indicative and I want to bring them to the attention of the House. They are not contradictions or incongruities but the reflection of the historic changes that have taken place in the world. Revolutionary changes have taken place. Standards of thingshave changed, so have economic conditions in our country. Prudent changes have taken place in the Canadian economic

situation and the speeches made in this Chamber reflected--- a desire for a new policy, a striving for a policy into which Canada can fit in, as a result of these changes. In essence, it is a striving for an independent Canadian policy. People will not label it this way---some do not face the understanding that it means that---but actually that is what it amounts to and it is significant that in the discussions here, more than at any time since 1911, was there such strong expressions against American domination for a policy of trading with the world.

Mr. Speaker, if hon. some members will not be shocked, and I hope they will not be, I will say that some of their remarks sounded as if they had been taken out of the editorials of the Canadian Tribune. Hold your seats, gentlemen. I know they do not read the Canadian Tribune, but they sounded to me like editorials from thatTribune. It remindsme of the man who made the remark on poetry and prose "I went through life speaking prose and all the time I was not aware of it."

There has been a lot of common sense used by all sides of the House on our plan, and it isnot criticized. We are getting there. We are here to help you. Some of us are far ahead of others. We are there and you are coming along. The fact is this is a universal phenomenon.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, the January 24th issue of the United States News, a very conservative-minded publication in the United States, and I will read a few lines, and may I suggest it to the hon. members in the centre. The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) wants to be called that way, so I place him in the centre. I want to make it clear thathe wanted to be a centre man. I will read a few lines fromthe United States News:

"Key countries in Western Europe and Asia want to pull out of the 'cold war.' They have had enough.

"They want U.S. to change itspolicies. If U.S. doesn't, trend is toward neutrality as between the United States and Soviet Russia.

"It's a severe jolt for the U.S., a significant trend in world affairs.

"So far, this desire to get out of the cold war is not official. But is is an upsurge of opinion that officials can't ignore and stay in office.

"It's in the air in London and Paris, in New Delhi, Bangkok, Tokyo."

We in our own Ontario reflect this world grouping and have a way out.

In the face of such situations I think we should ask what does the Speech from the Throne offer. But it does not propose to deal with this question. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, but with one exception it does not offer a solution to the problem. That one excpption is thatpart of the speech that refers to the measures concerning discriminatory covenants, and I congratulate the government on that. There will be an opportunity to speak on it. I think it is useful.

For the rest, one cannot be too critical. The speech devotes exactly three and one-half lines to what concerns the health and welfare of the people of this province. It is so brief I can read it to you:

"Since the introduction of capital and maintenance grants to public, general and convalescent hospitals in 1947, great strides have been made in the provision of hospital accommodation. This form of assistance to the better health and welfare of the people will continue."

(Take F follows)

I say, Mr. Speaker, that I think these three and one-half lines, I suggest to you, constitutes a terrible indictment of the backwardness of social thinking of this government. To dispense with such vital questions in meaningless three and one-half lines cannot be but a colossal indictment of the government. There is a very important question of welfare. I am not going to discuss the entire welfare problem but only one, say, the means test on old age pensions. Why has not this government made clear that it desires abolition of the means test. I would challenge the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow), not as an individual, he knows that, but as the hon. member of the government dealing with it, to come out now and say: "We are in favor of the immediate abolition of the means test," and let it be heard in Ottawa.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): I think, Mr. Speaker, the Federal leader of our Party has made that abundantly clear.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I was afraid of that. I have just finished showing the contradictions between the statements of the leader of the Conservative Party and the Conservative government in this House. Now, that is passing the buck. This government is a government of the largest, most industrialized and wealthiest province and if this province were now to go out today and say to Ottawa: "We want the abolition of the means test," I am prepared to predict that it would be abolished.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Drew was over that in 1946.

MR. SALSBERG: Right, but it is passing the buck back and forth. We spend a lot of time here discussing matters of Federal character. There is nothing more important than this question in which the province and the Federal government are in partnership. For this partner to say: "Yes, we want it abolished," I

would ask the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) to move on, to come out and say he is in favor and his government is in favor of the abolition. I mention the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) because he knows tens of thousands of workers, to mention but one industry, auto, are vitally concerned with this question now, today in their battle for an adequate pension or retirement fund. He knows undoubtedly that there is a danger of a strike developing in that very important industry on this very important question of pensions and that he could help to solve the problem for them and for other workers by standing up in his seat now and saying: "Yes, as the hon. Minister of Labor of this government, I am in favor of the abolition of the means test, and this government will go to Ottawa and will ask it." Hon. members of this government have gone to Ottawa for less important things and I am waiting for the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) to say something. To give him time, another minute or so, I want to say that thousands of workers in Windsor are waiting for that answer, and in Brantford and in Oshawa and in Toronto, anxiously waiting. They are in the midst of negotiation. If the means test were abolished the possibility would immediately arise for an amicable settlement in that industry. It would help workers in all basic industries where the question of the means test is being dealt with. The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) undoubtedly knows of the campaign going on across the country and conducted by most unions, particularly by auto and steel and some others, seeking to abolish the means test. Ottawa says: "We are partners with the province," and the province says: "The national leadership of our Party is in favor," and yet, you are the ones who could cut them out right away. I am sorry the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is not here because I would turn to him after failing to get a positive statement from the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) and the hon. Minister of

Labor (Mr. Daley) on this question.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I am still ready to sit down if the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) would like to rise. May I remind him, in addition to Windsor, Oshawa, Brantford and Toronto waiting, St. Catharines is also waiting for some action. They, too, are in negotiation on the pensions question and the hon. member (Mr. Daley) represents a constituency of which St. Catharines is a very important chunk. Do I hear a reply?

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor): Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to do my own thinking and not have the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) put words in my mouth, what he wants me to say.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this announcement that the hon, Minister (Mr. Daley) prefers to do his own thinking. I hope he will succeed in his effort.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: I assure the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) I have no intention of presuming to be his tutor but I do think it is not a question of who puts words into his mouth. I think we would be quite happy if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) chose hiw own words to make it abundantly clear that the government is for the immediate abolition of the means test and is going to Ottawa to do that. We have been given three and a half lines dealing with this and othermatters relating to health and welfare.

I find, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne does give a lot of space to such questions as unemployment and agriculture. There is three-quarters of a page devoted to unemployment and I read it again and again and again, to marvel at the obvious need of the government to have so many words to cover nothing. Surely that could have been covered in fewer words. The section on unemployment constitutes nothing but an alibi which the government is preparing on this vital issue. You will remember in the

good days it was, "We did it, we were responsible for the employment, productivity and even for the increased laying of eggs and production of milk," and so on. However, now, things are not the same and the Speech from the Throne speaks about Federal responsibility, national responsibility, international responsibility and monetary factors. I was waiting to hear also about planetary factors, beyond their control. Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the crisis is not an act of God and is not the responsibility of outside forces. The fact is, it is up to us and this government can and must do things and do them in a hurry to solve this problem. That is true of agriculture also. There are a lot of words but no solution. We are confronted, Mr. Speaker, with this phenomena, that Ontario agriculturists are hit this time as the wheat farmers in the West in the pre-war crisis. This is n t a wheat crisis that is hitting, it is a crisis in Ontario, eggs, cheese, hogs, honey, curtailment of production of the acreage in tobacco and elsewhere. It is not a temporary affair.

I might quote for a moment from the Rural Cooperator for February 26th, in an editorial they saythe following, and I would ask the hon. members from the countryside to listen:

> "The January 6th issue of the United States News carried in its business outlook for 1950 an interesting forecast:
>
> > 'Corporate profits estimated up one billion, six hundred million dollars.
> > Farm cash income estimated down one billion,, six hundred million dollars.'"

Further down, the editorial says:

> "If the United States News forecast is correct the money farmers won't get in 1950 is going into the pocket of the coupon clippers!
>
> "Time to wake up, farmer! Time to buy yourself

an organization to fight back!"

I say the 1950 conditions in the United States agriculture apply with equal force to the prospects in this country. What is the problem? The problem as raised and the proposal made by the hon. leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) in the House is, I believe, very correct, but I would suggest he take it up with the Liberal government in Ottawa, too. The same paper from which I quoted has an editorial of January 10th issue in which they deal withthe speech made bythe Deputy-Minister of Agriculture, Mr. McCubbin in which he is quoted as having said on behalf of the Federal Minister of Agriculture, he said it was impossible to balance our trade with Britain,---"To ask 13,000,000 people to balance trade with 50,000,000 is impossible ---it never will be possible."

Then, further he says:

> "The British are shrewd traders. They are going to buy where they can buy the cheapest. Unless we can give them as cheap an egg as other people they will buy from other countries. And the same applies to bacon."

Then, he adds these brilliant words:

> "We are going to buy the majority of our goods from the United States---even if it means paying a little more for our goods we will still buy from the United States."

This paper them asks, "Whom is Mr. McCubbin working for? The Canadian farmer or the United States Chamber of Commerce?"

That is a very good question and I suggest to the hon. Liberal members of this House that they ask Ottawa this question, "Who is the Ottawa government working for?"

Now then, in the face of such a situation, hon. members speak about "labor asking too much." As the hon. member for Welling-

ton North (Mr. McEwing) said, if we are going to go down, let us go down together, labor and the farmer. That is wrong and I know how sincere the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) is about problems affecting farmers and the welfare of the province. I say the big thing is to prevent either group going down. That is the task. There is no need for either labor or the farmers going down. What is the answer? The answer is to strengthen the unity between labor and farmer groups so, far from going down, we go up together, and it can be done. Nothing will be more damaging than to permit the forces from without to divide the farm and labor groups at this critical time. Trade with Britain, of course---I remarked about that two years ago whenI came back from Europe, about the fact that we were not trading enough, we were not selling enough and we were not buying enough. Let us also remember it is necessary to go beyond Britain because Britain cannot and anyone who says it can is wrong, absorb everything we produce on the farm and in the factory. However, there is a big wide world to trade with. Lest hon. members onthe government side look with suspicion at me, I will read to them one sentence of a speech delivered inthe House of Commons by one of their leaders, a former leader of their party in this House, the hon. Earl Rowe. Was he not a leader of the government in this province? Sure, he led the party in an election---I am not rubbing it in, I do not say to defeat, I said he led them in an election. Here is what he said in the House of Commons, February 27th on this very question. He urged the government, according to the Globe & Mail, to look eastward for trade, inst ad of north and south. He said many other things I do not want to burden the House with. I am ready to agree with a statement made by a Conservative spokesman or a Liberal spokesman or the Globe & Mail or the Telegram, if it is correct. In this instance it is correct. "There are hundreds of millions of people anxious to trade with

us and it is not just agriculture." The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) cited some very important figures in his speech about the decline in production in some basic industries and you must realize that what I referred to in the beginning of my remarks about profound changes taking place in the world necessitates a different approach. A third of the world is now outside of what is called the Imperialist sphere and they are ready to trade. Much agricultural produce could go to China, 450,000,000 people and our machinery could go to these countries and I agree with Mr. Rowe when he said not only to look north and south but east and west. Of course, by the development of natural resources, the processing of these resources at home will provide jobs. There are possib ilities for trade and we must want it, not rely on the restriction that the present Federal government policies are placing on Canadian trade and the possibility of exporting agriculture and industrial production of this country. That is a dangerous trend which is taking place for which that government is responsible at Ottawa.

Now, hon. members will say: "If the United States dollars do not come, how are we going to manage?" I want to say to the hon. members, after you voted for Bill number 36 without a murmur, without a sob or a sigh, you certainly should not permit any colonial thinking to prevail. Get rid of this colonial montality. . . . Canada is not a colony that trades for foreign capital for its development, Canada is an imperialist power, of a second rank, but a great power of its own. Capital for development? Why, Mr. Speaker, this country is sending out millions, hundreds of millions of capital. Canada is a capital exporting nation. Now, have you ever heard of Brazilian Traction? Well, that is controlled in Toronto. Have you heard of the Mexican Light and Power. That is controlled on King Street. Have you ever heard of Barcelona?

I do not mean the city, but the Barcelona Light and Power and Traction? It is controlled in a big building on King Street. Have you heard of big investments of Canadian dollars in Cuba, in San Salvador? Of course, they are controlled on St. James Street and King Street. Have you heard of E. P. Taylor's extension in the United States in breweries and Honey Dew? I do not say there is anything wrong with it but it is Canadian capital. Have you heard of the George Weston buying up a little empire? Canadian capital going there. Have you heard of Canadian Distilleries becoming the second biggest distillery in the world? That is Canadian capital. Stop talking about capital, you have passed Bill 36.

AN hon. MEMBER: Any in Moscow?

MR. SALSBERG: I understand Moscow has no capital for export. That is in reply to an hon. member who woke up. When he heard me talk about capital he understood I was talking about capital versus socialism. There is enough money in this country to finance any big development. The brokers and trust companies on Bay Street will give you all the money you require to develop. Let us stop crying about where we are going to get the capital and what would we do without the American dollars. Why, we could even have the Imperial Oil Company owned in Canada if they could get their hands on it. Worry about that.

Now, I say on this question, too, this government should take action. It is true it is in the main Federal, that is true, but why cannot this government adopt the resolution? This government adopted a resolution which created a national crisis ---national crisis which caused the Federal government to prorogue and go to the country in an election. That was not a provincial question, was it? Of course not. Why cannot this government bring in a resolution, that it ask the Federal government to adopt a foreign trade policy that will enable this country to

trade freely with the world. It would be a great step in the solution of agricultural problems and also industrial problems.

Onthe question of unemployment, I want to say it is not temporary, it is not seasonal. If you want to know my own conviction on the question, it is a product of the system. The system produces it periodically just as frost produces Ice.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York, East): "Jack" or "Leslie."

MR. SALSBERG: I was not referring to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost). Then, as certain germs provide certain developments in the body, I say our foreign trade policy, of course, had something to do with it but it is hot a temporary affair, it is not an isolated affair, it is not only a problem of one community. Of course, it is not the fault of displaced persons. I am sorry to have heard an hon. member speak the way he did and I hope the hon. member who "went to town" impressing it will see this printed refutation. The best I can do is quote from an article that I wrote, printed January 23rd, which is a week before publication. It has to be written, you know. This is dealing with this very question and it is entitled, "Unemployment, D. P.s and the unions." I shall quote from some part of it.

> "There is much to be said about the early experiences of unfolding of struggle of the unemployed. This will be done. For the present, however, I want to draw attention to a rather dangerous sign which has appeared on the battlefront of the unemployed and which requires a careful and balanced approach. I have reference to the question of the D. P.s and to immigration in general.
>
> "The press reported that spokesmen for the eunemployed have protested against the practise of employingg D.P.s rather than native or naturalized Canadians; that they demanded the halting of all

immigration and that immigration was blamed by them for our growing unemployment situation. What is right and what is wrong, what is useful and what isharmful in these reported statements? The labor movement can ill afford to make mistakes on this important issue. Lets look at the facts.

"The economic crisis which is spreading in our country was not caused by the recenty admitted immigrants. The crippling crisis of the 30s which gripped all capitelist countries in the world had nothing to do with either the emigration of people from European countries or their immigration into the United States or Canada. In fact the doors were tightly locked to immigrants both here as well as in the United States yet we experienced the most severe unemployment in history. It was capitalism which produced the crisis then and which is spreading unemployment now."

Then, further down:

"The ad ssion of immigrants is not the cause of certain just complaints which the trade unions and the unemployed are making but it is the government's immigration policy that is the real cause of the trouble. With but minor exceptions the government pursued a most reactionary, anti-labor, cold war immigration policy. The exceptions are the garment workers schemes in which the union participated, the orphan schemes, and the very restircted near relatives scheme. An exception also is the British immigration scheme. Regardless of the motives of the Drew government

the fact is that the British immigrants came as individuals and each found his own place in the life of the country.

But the main phase of Ottawa's immigration policy was based on cold war considerations. Big business was permitted to select its own 'work gangs' inthe D. P. camps. Labor had neither voice nor infuence in the affair."

(Take G follows)

Big business was permitted to select its own work gangs in the D.P. camps. Labour had neither voice nor influence in that affair. I might add that I was there and saw it being done. I was in the camps in Germany, and saw the representatives of the mining, lumber and steel plants picking them as if they were on an auction block, which could not be said of the Ontario scheme. My proposal is that a new scheme be adopted in which labour will participate and help carry it through. It is not the D.P.'s, no. The situation is serious, as is its effect on communities.

If the hon. Prmier (Mr. Frost) were here, I could show him that it even affects Lindsay. Today the press gave us a picture of a fortunate young man who won $14,425. in a lottery. Well, I do not know if it is legal, I am not suggesting anything been done to the poor fellow, nor am I suggesting it is right to keep that a secret from one's wife, but I suggest to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) that this constituent of his was unemployed for five months. Now his problem is temporarily solved. We are not going to solve the problems of thousands and thousands of our unemployed by lottery games, are we?

And I would remind him also it is not just Toronto, the press a few days ago carried a story of one thousand unemployed in his native town of Orillia. And that is true in Toronto, in Hamilton, and in all other cities, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government on the question of unemployment has so far offered nothing. That is harsh, you might say, but that is true. You have work projects that may and will be developed.

MR. A. MACPHAIL (York East): If they live long enough.

MR. SALSBERG: But in the meantime, there is nothing

being done. The government says it will co-operate with Ottawa. Knowing that Ottawa does nothing, we will get double nothing. That is what it amounts.to.

And you do not have to go far to see it. Now, you may not like this picture, but that is a striking photograph that the Globe produced. And that is not the only one, they have another one of another mission crowded to the door, and then a picture of men sleeping on the benches in a church. All you have to do is read headlines to see how serious this situation has become.

I will read headlines from the daily press -- all papers. One of them is:

"Find Mobs Turned Out at 'Clerk Wanted' Ad"

That is from the Toronto Star, and underneath a very ironical heading:

"Free Enterprise Key to Jobs" says St. Laurent, same page.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: And take another one:

"Transients Jam Station; Arrest Twenty-three in Coach Yards".

That is from the Star.

"All Jobless Shelters Full, Eight Sleep in Church Gallery"

Again, the Star.

"Jobless Sleep in Church Pews, get Free Meal", says the Globe.

"Can't Blame the Reds -- Pastor Says Crisis of 30's Back", and so on and on.

And we are in this situation:

Mr. Drew was in Toronto this week. He took his candidate, Mr. Hees down to the church to see the hungry and the

roofless provided with a shelter, and I am sure the government will not object to my reading from the "Telegram".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: This refers to Mr. Drew's visit, only a couple of days ago. Here is what it says --

AN hon. MEMBER: What's the heading?

MR. SALSBERG: The heading:

"Drew, Hees cheered"

then it goes on to say: "Get 'real story' ":

"Seeking first-hand information on unemployment conditions in the city, honourable George Drew and George Hees, Progressive Conservative candidate in Broadview riding visited Rev. Ray McCleary's Woodgreen United Church last night where 130 unemployed workers were being fed.

Mr. Drew told the men, mostly members of the Union of Unemployed Workers, that insufficient information on unemployment conditions was being released and that he wanted to get the 'real story' from the men themselves.

Both he and Mr. Hees talked to many of the unemployed men individually and report that what they learned convinced them immediate action must be taken to relieve unemployment."

That is the impression Mr. Drew and Hees claim to have gotten in their visit two days ago.

And this government, in the face of such conditions, has one answer: "We will co-operate with Ottawa". Now, that does not offer anything. You leave it to the cities and I have here editorials of every Toronto paper urging action. The Globe has an editorial entitled:

"A Civic Scandal"

and I agree with this editorial, which says:

> "Nothing excuses the situation. There is merely the fact: we have a responsibility to provide sufficient and amply equipped accommodation -- and we haven't done it. There are no extenuating circumstances. No one knows where those unable to find even bare floor accommodation spent recent sub-zero nights. And there is no alternative to finding and equipping suitable shelter -- " and so on. I agree with that. You cannot escape that, and you cannot dodge it, morally, you cannot dodge it.

The Star editorial of January 30th suggests that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the municipalities get together.

And here is an editorial out of the Telegram and it is called:

"Humanity Dictates Action"

It is not often I can quote editorials of the Globe and Telegram, but I am quoting one paragraph of the editorial of the Telegram of February 23, which says:

> "In a recent series of articles in the Telegram and in the Globe and Mail picture the deplorable plight of the unemployed has been graphically presented. Governments at all levels, municipal, provincial and Federal must accept and discharge their varying responsibilities. It is not open to them to ask, "Am I my brother's keeper'?"

and this government has done nothing and is responsible, not merely for the suffering of men, women, and children, by refusing to accept the responsibily for cash relief, but it

is responsible also for influencing very good people to think wrongly and dangerously.

I have the highest regard for the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Pryde), I have the impression that he is a nice, kindly man, which I am sure that he is, and I am sure that he is the kind of man who would get up in the middle of the night if you were to call him and tell him someone was hungry and suffering anywhere within his reach, and that he would go to their assistance. I know that, but this government policy which he felt he is obliged to defend somehow led him to a statement here which is regrettable, in my opinion. I know he cannot mean it when he said, "It is not our responsibility" and "It is not our business". You cannot do that, and I say the government is responsible for that unfortunate statement, because the hon. member (Mr. Pryde) is one of the best liked people here, and a very humane person. He could not have made that statement if it were not because of the government policy, and I say this cannot go on.

I was looking at a Bible and I got a note before I started speaking, from my hon. friend, my colleague, the Whip of the largest group. (Mr. Murdoch) Sometimes we refer to each other as "Whips" of different groups, and he asked whether I was seeking inspiration in the Bible, before I started to speak, and I nodded and said, "Yes". Well, you know I sometimes say I can trace my ancestry away back to the prophets, and I wish I would have but a spark of their indignation to speak out against the policy of the government in the case of unemployment, particularly on the question of cash relief. I have not got a spark, even of what they had, of moral

indignation and the thunder that they hurled at iniquity and the failure of governments to act.

Well, this is true, everyone in his private life, I imagine, I think, is a good man, but I say, why not practice on Monday what we preach on Sunday? How can you do that? How can you, when men are standing in line waiting for a bowl of hot water with a few vegetables in it, and this the richest province?

And even if it were only on a temporary basis, it should be done. You cannot turn your back on them and say: "It is not our business, St. Laurent says free enterprise will solve it". He will not do a thing, and Toronto says they are afraid to assume the responsibility because they will go bankrupt, as they nearly did in the last crisis, and this government will report, I am sure, a big surplus. I am sure it will, and I say, "How can we, in the face of surpluses and of buoyant incomes say we cannot spend a few hundred thousand dollars to carry the unemployed so they will not have to sleep on floors of markets and missions and benches in churches, and stand in line in sub-zero weather, in torn shoes, waiting for a bowl of soup?

I am not trying to make you cry, no. Am I better than you? No. But I am in the opposition, and I can speak up, and it is my duty to do so, and I appeal to the government to reconsider its stand. It is not a big amount of money. We certainly can carry it on. And I say that the government should insist that Ottawa act. We can do it. I assure you that a motion to the men at Ottawa to act will be supported by every hon. member of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: And that will sound in Ottawa much more strongly than the letter of the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost). Let us do that. Let us have a standing vote. Let the government take the initiative in asking for it. If everyhon. member here, regardless of party affiliation, will stand and say, "We demand of Ottawa that it act and assume its reponsibilities",

-- "We will assume", rather, " our responsibilities and not let the men go hungry."How can we turn our backs and shut the windows because it is cold and say,in another few months the cold will be over and ~~we~~ will be drifting all over?

Mr. Speaker, I see it is rather late, and with your permission, I would move the adjournment --

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I might say if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is anywhere near finished, we will be very pleased to let him finish.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, in view of what the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Doucett) said, I will not continue. I have a number of important items that I thought should be dealt with in the speech. I will do so on another occasion, and I will finish now.

(Take H follows)

that the government will on this, and perhaps on other questions begin to act. Let the province lead the country towards paths which will provide employment, and markets for whatever we produce; let the province take a stand on the question of the means test, and by taking a stand, will have it abolished and save a lot of industrial strife. Let this Government take the lead in the fight to gain jobs for the unemployed, and failing to get jobs for them, to provide them with a minimum that is required, for shelter and for food.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROSS SCOTT (Beaches): I see the hour is somewhat late, and if it meets with your approval, Mr.Speaker, I will move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I may say we will proceed with Bills tomorrow for part of the time, and possibly have a couple of speeches on the Throne Debate, adjourning early, as it is Friday.

I move the House do now adjourn, and when it concludes the present sitting thereof, it stands adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:08 o'clock p.m.

Volume 17.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS TENTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

/ / / / / /
- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Friday, March 10, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

/ / / / / /
- - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled, "An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Board Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) give a short explanation?

MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker;-

Sections 1 and 2. These amendments authorize the appointment of two vice-chairmen for the Ontario Municipal Board.

Section 3. Heretofore section 14 has authorized one member of the Board to deal with matters that are not opposed. This provision is removed. Under the re-enacted section 14 the chairman is authorized to direct what members of the Board shall deal with any matter before the Board, and to designate a member of the Board staff to attend any sittings. Provision is made in subsection 2 of the new section 13 that all orders, rules, etc., of the Board may be signed either by the chairman or by a vice-chairman.

Section 4. The power to authorize one member to report to the Board on any matter has heretofore been vested in the Board and the chairman. Henceforth this power will be vested only in the chairman.

Section 5. The repealed provision required the secretary of the Board to attend all sittings of the Board.

Section 6. This section is re-enacted to provide that notwithstanding the new requirement in subsection 2 of section 13 (see section 3 of this Bill), the certificate of the Board on debentures validated may be signed by any member of the Board.

Section 7. This amendment authorizes signature of notices by a vice-chairman as well as by the chairman and secretary.

Section 8. This amendment provides that any document purporting to be signed by a vice-chairman shall be prima facie evidence, without proof of signature, that the document was duly signed.

HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

MR. JOHN G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Deputy Speaker, (Mr. Patrick) if he will carry on for a little while from now, in view of the fact that there are a great number of students from the London Normal School here, part of whom are in the hon. member's (Mr. Patrick) riding, and part of whom are in the riding of the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder).

I know the hon. members will be very glad to have the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Patrick) handle whatever business is to come along for a little while.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (rime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 14, 30, 31, 35, 36, 41, 67 and 61. I know the hon. members opposite will be moving me a vote of thanks, before very long.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): You are doing better.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may say that next week we will be taking up with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the question of all those orders for returns, held over from last year.

MR. FROST: Do not tell me.

MR. DUNBAR: Why do you say that, at the weekend?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: Order No. 1.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 80, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 80.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE TEACHING PROFESSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 81, "An Act to amend the Teaching Profession Act, 1944", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 81.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Private Bills, Order No. 9.

CANADA CONFERENCE EVANGELICAL CHURCH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, second reading of Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting Canada Conference Evangelical Church", Mr. Houck.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 4.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

THE HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children", Mr. Rea.

MR. CHARLES E. REA (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE TOWNSHIP OF CORNWALL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Township of Cornwall", Mr. McDonald.

MR. J. L. McDONALD (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Township of Cornwall".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

THE CITY OF GUELPH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, second reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act respecting the City of Guelph", Mr. Edwards.

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Edwards, I move second reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act respecting the City of Guelph".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

THE PROVINCIAL YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec", Mr. Blackwell.

MR. CHARLES REA (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I move second reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are some matters here which are more or less routine, and which might be advanced a stage at this time. It is my intention to go on with the addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne about three o'clock. If any hon. member wants any order called held out, I will be glad to do so. I notice on the Order Paper there are three or four orders marked "Printed", but I do not believe they are in the Order Book, so I will not call them.

Order No. 43.

THE STATUTE LABOUR ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-third Order, second reading of Bill No. 91, "An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act", Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of HIGhways): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 91, "An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 44.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-fourth Order, second reading of Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker,I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 47.

THE BUSINESS RECORDS PRODUCTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No.95, "An Act to repeal the Business Records Production Act, 1947", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER :(Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 95, "An Act to Repeal the Business Records Production Act, 1947".

MR. LESLIE E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) who is piloting this Bill.

As I understand, the original was placed on the books to protect our own companies from people outside of the

country asking for information out of these records, as a matter of right or principle.

This would remove all protection, and I presume in doing so, it makes it a little easier for parent companies and associate companies in the United States to get information from branch companies in this country.

The point I wish to bring up, if repealing this Act leaves our companies unprotected, as regards the request by the hon. Attorney General of the United States, or of some State, for the production of records in which they may have some interest, I am wondering if the fact that certain congressmen have been asking for an enquiry into the pulp and paper industry in this country -- if the government feels our pulp and paper companies are sufficiently protected, if this Act is repealed.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, we do not think there is any question about them being sufficiently protected, under all the circumstances.

At the time this Act was introduced, there was some attempt to subpoena records and books, as the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) will recall, and at that time, because there was some question as to their right to do so -- I felt they did not have the right -- we passed this as sort of an extra precautionary measure.

We have found since, this has had the effect recently of interfering with another type of activity entirely, and as a result of recommendations from our own Securities Commission, we are now proposing this Bill be repealed, because we have found a number of companies which have attempted to get

registration in the United States, where they wish to sell their shares, if they want to be registered with the United States Security Commission, or with the Security Commission of any State, as long as the Act remains, the said Commission might not have access to some of their records, and if one of the conditions of selling shares is that the records should be available to the American authorities, that is something they are entitled to have, and that is the reason for passing this legislation.

MR. WISMER: We can take this up again in committee, to be sure there is sufficient protection. I agree with the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) that anything that stands in the way of clearing up the security situation downtown, I am in favour of. But some attempt might be made in the future, where somebody might require information, and the question is whether sufficient protection has been provided in that regard.

MR. PORTER: I think I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) that the opinion of the law officers of the Crown is that a subpoena issued from the United States would not be effective here, in view of some doubt which was cast on that some few years ago, but there does not seem to be much of a doubt about it now.

MR. WISMER: Will that help to clear up the securities trouble?

MR. PORTER: Do not interject some complicated, troublesome matter, which is not a part of this Bill.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD(Bellwoods): May I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) a question.

MR. PORTER: I shall answer with pleasure, if possible.

MR. MacLEOD: Is it not a fact that the companies

protected by this legislation when it was introduced were American companies doing business in Canada?

MR. PORTER: I do not recall which particular companies were being protected. This was a general Act, protecting any company.

MR. MacLEOD: I would think, if you permit me to say so ,, --

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) may be right. I do not know.

MR. MacLEOD: I think it is rather important that the hon. Attorney General(Mr. Porter) should be able to recall the circumstances which gave rise to this legislation in the first place; my recollection is that this Act was designed to protect American companies doing business in Canada, whose operations were then under investigation in the United States. That was my impression.

MR. SALSBERG: That is so, definitely.

MR. PORTER: Does it make any difference in this Bill, if it is repealed, as to what companies might have been protected under the original Act? I can enquire, and get that information for the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) if he wants it. I have nothing to hide. We are only repealing the Act. If the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) thinks we should not repeal the Act, he is free to argue. We have never been able to stop him yet.

MR. MacLEOD: I am quite convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) has nothing to hide, but I think when a piece of legislation of this kind comes before the House, the sponsor of the Bill should be properly informed as to the circumstances which gave rise to the legislation in the first place, and I must say that I got the

definite impression in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) introductory remarks, that there was some doubt in his mind as to whether the legislation was desirable in the first place.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I personally did not entertain any doubt at that time, because I was in a different capacity then, and in those days I had no doubt. But now, being in more of a legal capacity, I have doubts more frequently. I do not think it really makes any difference as to whether some of these companies which might have been protected by this legislation were companies which were subsidiary to the American companies or not. The law is that a company incorporated under our own legislation, in Ontario, is a separate entity, and it does not matter whether the shareholders live in Brazil, or whether they live in Great Britain, or in Ontario, the company is here, and it is a Canadian company. It does not matter what the nationality may be or the domicile may be, of the people who hold the shares.

It may be that some companies which gained whatever protection there might have been under this Act, had shareholders in the United States; shares might have been held by companies in the United States; there might have been the relationship of what is generally termed, "Parent and Child" as between these companies, but legally, that makes no difference. We are concerned in this country with the rights which exist to a company incorporated under our laws, and which has those rights, no matter who the shareholders may be.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, just to press the point further; surely the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) does not suggest that the Legislature of Ontario should be a party to any move which would defeat the ends of justice in any other country.

MR. PORTER: We are not a party to any move which will defeat the ends of justice anywhere.

MR. FROST: Anywhere in the world.

MR. CHARLES COX (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I am forced to say I know little or nothing about this Bill, because I have not read it, but I was interested in the subsequent discussion.

I do not know the purport of the Bill but from the remarks there was some information pertaining to the handling of the natural resource which was affected. Whatever the sphere of the Bill may be, I hope that nothing will be done to prevent information at some time being brought to the attention of the hon. members of the House, which might be very illuminating. I hope you are not closing the door. I do not know if or when it may be, but I hope at some time, if I stay in the House, there will be a committee formed which might secure some very valuable information, valuable to all hon. members of the House. I hope nothing in this Bill, or any other Bill, will preclude bringing something before this House which will be illuminating.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PRIME MINISTER): Order No. 48.

THE EXTRA PROVINCIAL CORPORATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-eighth Order, second reading of Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend the Extra Provincial Corporations Act", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend the Extra Provincial Corporations Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 50.

THE COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fiftieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 98, "An Act to amend the Companies Act", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 98, "An Act to amend the Companies Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 51.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-first Order, second reading of Bill No. 99, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act", Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, second reading of Bill No. 99.

MR. CHARLES COX (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) give us some idea of the purpose of this Bill?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): The explanation already given on this Bill really covers it. It applies to deeds to sale township land. The residence requirements were lightened last year for free grant land, and we felt that sale township land should be placed on the same basis.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the chair.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Private Bills, Order No. 3.

THE TOWN OF PORT HOPE AND TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the Town of Port Hope and Trinity College School", Mr. Foote.

Sections 1 to 5; schedule "A" agreed to.

Bill No. 1 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton", Mr. Easton.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive; schedule "A"; schedule "B" agreed to.

Bill No. 2 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur," Mr. Robinson.

Sections 1 to 4; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

CENTRAL CANADA EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 9, "An Act Respecting Central Canada Exhibition Association", Mr. Morrow.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 9 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7

YOUNG MEN'S AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations", Mr. Murdoch.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 10 reported.

(Take B follows)

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 28.

BORDER CITIES YOUNG MENS AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order Number 7, House in Committee on Bill number 10, "An Act respecting Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association."

Sections 3 to13 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 10 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 8.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 8, House in Committee on Bill number 13, "An Act respecting North Hamilton Branch, Canadian Legion and Salvation Army," Mr. Thornberry.

Sections 1, 2 and 3 and the preamble carried.

Bill number 13 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 34.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: House in Committee on section 3 of Bill number 83, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act," Mr. Challies.

HON. G.H. CHALLIES (Minister of Hydro): Hon. members, this is the section we were discussing the other day which had to do with the purchase and lease of buildings not in use in general. Before anything can be done on this loan of buildings, an order-in-council must be passed. After this has passed we will then deal with all situations arising in that respect. We have been able to solve difficulties by negotiations, in the past. However, in some cases there have been considerable delays. In connection with steam plants there can be nothing possibly gained by agreement or otherwise, and they are delaying proceedings.

If the government feels we are asking too much by including that part of the section which says "notwithstand anything in or done," the Commission is willing to withdraw it.

We have had some serious problems in the past, or delaying problems, and as it gets more complicated it is more difficult.

MR THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Are you going to withdraw it?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minster):: These words have an aside meaning. If the situation arises, thenwe can deal with that situation. It maybe necessary to refer tosome acts which use the words "this or some other Legislature."

MR. JOLLIFFE: This wording be abandoned?

HON. L. M.FROST: Yes, it is withdrawn.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is understood that the Bill is amended by the deletion of this section.

HON. L. M. FROST)Prime Minister): Yes.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister of Hydro): Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill be reported and that section 3 be deleted.

Bill number 83, reported, section 3 deleted.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minster): Order number 35.

THE ICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT 1939

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 35. House in Committee on Bill number 85, "An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act, 1939,"

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Has the Bill been reported?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minster of Municipal Affairs): Yes, it wasreported.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing wrong in addressing a question, as it concerns a large section of the province.

Is it the intention of the government to implement the amendment made several years ago to increase the size to nine members?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that question is in order. I suggest that that question can be asked only when the Act is under consideration.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What amendment do you refer to?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: Section 2.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): There is an amendment before that.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I suggest the question is in order. When you consider an Act it is relevant to inquire about the intentions regarding that Act. It is relevant to ask any questions concerning any amendment of the Power Commission Act.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I think we can deal with any difficulties when the time arises.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the matter is well worthy of his consideration.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He accepts the responsibility.

MR. MacLEOD: The amendment is precise. We all thought we might get the job.

This took up the greater part of one afternoon with an emp ty speech from Mr. Drew and I think you will be rewarded by looking into it.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I will get it fromHansard and read it.

MR. MacLEOD: We will find the speech for you.

Bill reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minster): Order number 35.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT 1939

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 35, Housein Commitee on Bill number 85, "An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act,"

Mr. Kennedy.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 36.

MILK CONTROL ACT(

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 36, House inCommittee on Bill number 86, "An Act to amend the Milk Control Act."

Sections 1 agreed to.
On section 2:
MR. W. L. HOUSK (Niagara Fall): Why the change from 75% to 66%?

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): It was made for uniformity with all other acts. I will leave this Bill for third reading.

Section 2 agreed to.
On section 3:
MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St, Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I think you will acknowledge the fact that section 3 could be construed to mean an interference with private enterprise.

MR. KENNEDY: It does not work that way.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 38.

GAME AND FISHERIES ACT 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 38, House in Committee on Bill number 84, "An Act to amend the Game and Fisheries Act," Mr. Scott.

Section 1 agreed to.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): That will be going to the Fish and Games Committee, is that correct?

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Except for minor amendments for description. That was taken uplast season.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On Section 4:

MR. R. THORNBERRY: Air guns are the most dangerous around most of our larger cities and I would suggest that the House should bring in some legislation to ban the use of air guns altogether. There are a lot of little "gaffers" who like to shoot at horses and carts and street cars and at themselves.

AN hon. MEMBER: Keep that pistol down.

MR. THORNBERRY: I think they should be banned.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): It is not within our authority to ban the sale of them. That is beyond our province.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I have not seen any reference to wolf traps.

Sections 4, to 6 inclusive agreed to.

On section 7.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): Mr. Speaker, what is meant in subsection 2 of section 7:

> "No person shall employ any other person for gain or reward or hope thereof as a guide unless such other person is the holder of a guide's license."

What does the "hope" mean? -- that is in section 7.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Give us the definition of the word.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Actually, I am not an expert. In redent developments in the northwestern section of the province it has been found dangerous to the hunter to wander around without a guide. What has been taking place is that guests have been coming over and going out with the owner of an establishment, who was not a qualified guide, and they have gotten themselves lost and often with serious results. There must be qualified guides. It is too large a country

to wander around without a guide.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Does not the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) consder that the use of the word superfluous. Where is the "hope," coming in? That is what I would like to nw.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): It is the hope of the reward.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): You are quibbling.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Where there is life there is hope.

Sections 7 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

On section 13.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, on subsection 3 of clause 13, I have had a number of calls respecting the use of ferrets in the hunting of rabbits or game. I have had a number of calls from men who are interested in that form of sport, a form of sport for the working men. I am also interested in that section from the point of view of the fruit growers. Girdling of the fruit trees will destroy them and it is a question of whether or not we should try to raise more cotton tails in that area. I would like you to hold this section until we get around to getting the opinion of the fruit growers.

These persons are in favor of the conservation measures which include the sale of "cotton tails". I do not believe they should be destroyed by ferrets.

Would you be good enough to withdraw it until we get further information?

HON. H. R. SCOTT: We have had some discussions with ferret owners. They realize that the rabbit angle at the present time is at a low ebb.

AN hon. MEMBER: It will not be long before they grow.

HON. H. R. SCOTT: In a year or two years from now we will come back and see if we might take this out. The rabbit cycle is coming back. That is why we are bringing it in now. In a year or two we might takeit out. But we must have it in the Act.

MR. EASTON: Mr. Minister (Mr. Scott) have you had any requests in that area?

MR. SCOTT: .. We have had reports that rabbits are destroying the trees but we do not wish to take a chance. If they start to come back in a year's time we will remove this section. For the time being it will not be harmful.

If they come back, we will still have their parent stock but if they were destroyed over several years we would not.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Very inconsiderate.

Sections 13 and 14 agreed to.

On section 15.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): This is not a complaint. This is the type of thing the coon hunters have asked for themselves.

Sections 15 to 17 inclusive, agreed to.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Just a minute. If we strike out that whole section who will administer it? Who is responsible for that trapping area?

HON. H. R. SCOTT : What section are you peaking of?

MR. DENNISON: Section 17. It strikes out the whole section.

MR. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): It strikes out section 47.

MR. DENNISON: It is given onthe page opposite.

&c.

MR. SCOTT: That is hunting on private land. That is not a government lease.

Sections 17 to 24, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Reported.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole House begs to report certain Bills and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 33.

THE DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 33, resuming the adjourned debate of the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the Opening of the Session.

Motion agreed to.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, last year I talked about the Liquor Act and Juvenile Delinquency, and higher education. I will not speak on all of them. But I will deal with one of them, from where I left off last year, that is the problem of higher education in Ontario. The second is a subject I do not believe has been discussed in the House for four or five years.

I took the chance to drop around and examine Hansard and this speech has not been brought to the attention of the government. I will now do so.

The thrid stage is the "small business man," and the problem of the small business man is as acute as the attempts to meet his problem, problems set up by large organizations and chain stores and organizations of that type.

I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) is not here. It is his department. I want to say this: It seems to me that the problem of the small businessman is one that should be of pronounced interest to the government. They have very hard competition. I cannot find where this problem has been brought to the attention of the House and I should like to bring it before the House, Mr. Speaker.

About the small businessman, Mr. Speaker, in this province today there are slowly but surely being squeezed out by chain stores and other types of retail organizations and their status is becoming every day more uncertain, not because of underselling but because these large organizations practise many and various methods of unfair trade.

What I want to do is outline to the Legislature these unfair trade practises and suggest to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) three ways that could do a very great service to the small businessman.

First I would like to draw the attention of the House to the size of groups affected by the conditions that I shall later outline.

According to statistics in the Canada Year Book and elsewhere I find there are roughly 125,000 small businesses in Ontario made up in this manner: There are about 9,000 manufacturing establishments employing less than 100 persons. And there are about 42,000 retail establishments, 45,000 proprietors working on their own account and 15,000 service

establishments.

I think the government will agree that this is a large and a very important section of our economy. I am sure the hon. members of the House will agree that their problems should be of great concern to us.

We have policies and programs for the working man, this side of the House has, we have laws and regulations covering the farmers and other elements of the community, but this government, or its predecessors, never seems to have formulated

(Page B-11 follows)

any policy which will adequately meet the needs of small business-men. The purpose of my speech is to urge the government to adopt a policy at this Sessions of the Legislature that will enable the small businessman to progress. I have discussed the problems with the small businessmen and shouldbe glad to speak of them to the hon. Minister (Mr Griesinger), and I will advertise any answers that the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) will give to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline to the Legislature the problem thatthis grouup is facing today. The small business-man is gradually being "squeezed out" by large chain organizations or by other mere monopoly establishments and inmost lines of businesses the same trend can be seen to a lesser or greater extent, although most of the instances are in the retail trade.

There is a grave situation, there is no doubt that the situatiom is grave indeed. In groceries, for example, the Ontario grocery chain store business in February 1948 was 50.6 per centum higher than in 1947. The independent gained only 5.5 per centum. but since this happened in a period of rising prices they actual lost in volume, they actually went down.

The trend is not a recent one, by any means, but has been continuing over a a long period of time. It has given great concern to the governments of the United States, British Columbia and Alberta and they have all taken steps to see that the small businessman receives a fair deal.

So much for that problem.

The third point, Mr. Speaker, is the reasons why this prob-lem has arisen in the province today.

It is my conviction that the major reasonwhy this problem has arisen in the province today, it is my conviction that the major reason for the "squeezing out" of the small businessman is that the chain stores

and other such large organizations practise consistently various unfair trade practices.

They use their great purchasing power in order to obtain special concessions, allowances and rebates, discounts and so on, from the manufacturers and the wholesalers, and this coupled with certain selling practices which I shall outline later, enables them to exert great pressure on the small independents. I would venture to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that were it not for these buying advantages which they enjoy, they would find it very difficult to prevent the independent operators from profitably meeting their competition. What I say, is that it is up to us to see that every person gets a fair deal. That is all anyone is asking from this government, or any government, whether it be C. C.F., Liberal or any government.

I do not wish to have any misunderstanding. I am not defending the inefficient retailer---he must get out or become efficient. I do say, however, Mr Speaker ; that any man who is efficient should be given a fair deal.

I do not say that I am against the chain stores. We know that they have taught the smaller man, by hisobservations, how to clean stores and to kepp windows clean and attractive and how to make a good window layout and to modernize the inside and outside of buildings. They have taught the small man how to cut down expenses and the small business man has gained something by observation.

They have shown the way in modern methods of merchandising, but this by itself does not explain their success. The major reason for their continued growth is that they have resorted and continued to resort to the use of unfair trade practises which place the smaller man at a distinct disadvantage.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): I want to make a remark, Mr. Speaker. I am very interested. I was a

small business man. I think that the statement made by the speaker (Mr. Scott, Beaches) indiates that the small businessman cannot compete with the larger ones. That isnot a fact. Any small business and many of them, do compete with big business.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): I am just coming to that, I am just coming to that point. I will deal with that later. I was going to go on to say that there are small operators who cut their costs down to compete but they are relatively few and are good businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on with these unfair trade practises and I think the House can understand what they are and how they operate, we should suggest some means of meeting them.

It is in the retail trade that the abuses are most obvious, but experiences in the trade are shared to a greater or lesser extent in other sections of industry. Once we examine these practices and see how they work we can then best suggest a method of the small man to meet the challenge which they present to his future welfare.

Let us take the first one, the practise of secret allowances and rebates and discounts. Some large chain stores can go to the manufacturer and force him to put up a product in a special size and of a special design in view of his great buying power. There is ample abuse of that.

In 1946 the A & P was fined $175,000 in the United States for various such unfair practises. Let me quote fromthe judge who heard the case:

> "The policy of the A & P was to use its power to get a lower price than that obtained by its competitors. It bought directly from suppliers and convinced the suppliers to reduce the price by the

"the amount of the brokerage fees. When this was outlawed, A & P adopted the policy whereby it would buy from no one who sold through a broker. Nor would it buy from a supplier who sold to anyone else through a broker."

And it goes on:

"The A & P also got discounts on large quantity purchases, and the supplier had to make his profits out of his other customers at higher prices."

There, Mr. Speaker, you have something concrete.

Needless to say these "other customers" are usually the smaller independents.

The report states:

"One cannot escape the conclusion that A & P succeeded in obtaining ..... discounts not only by force of its large purchasing power .... but through abuse of that power by the threats to boycott suppliers and place them on its individual blacklist!."

Mr. Speaker, I want to give this as an example to point out to the House that these tactics amounted to 22.15 per centum. of A & P's total profits in 1939, 22.4 per centum. in 1940 and 24.50 per centum in 1941.

(Page B-15 follows)

There, Mr. Speaker, you have an example of a large chain store using its buying power to exert pressure and coerce the buyer into meeting its demands. This gives the chain store a great advantage over its competitors.

In considering the effects of these practices, we must always bear in mind the welfare of the consumer, and we must ask ourselves how much he benefits from the discount and possible rebate. It is difficult to assess, but it seems probably that some of these savings are passed on to the consumer in lower prices. The chain stores have the axiom "sell it", by means of vast sales and with placards, they create the idea in the minds of the public that the buyer is getting something cheap. And it has worked.

As the consumer does receive some benefit from such saving, the method of attacking the problem would seem to be to place the small businessman in a position where he can buy on an equal basis with the larger organization. This could be done in two ways; one is by forcing the supplier to publish all such rebates, discounts and other forms of concessions made to the buyers, as part of his trade schedule, so that the small businessman will be aware that they can buy at these prices. Make them publish them.

Another way is by promoting the growth of co-operative purchasing groups which would allow all the small independents to buy collectively and thus make such savings available to them as well as to the large chain stores; so that the small men can pool together and place themselves in a somewhat similar position.

I shall refer to these suggestions later, but in the meantime, let me outline to you another very unfair trade practice, and that is "loss leader selling". This is a very simple but

very effective practice, and here is how it works. The chain stores select nationally-advertised products which are well known. They then cut the selling price down far below the cost of handling, and thus create a favourable impression with the buyers. The impression they try to create is that if these articles are so cheap then everything else in the store must be correspondingly low in price. The public feels that if it is charged more than this price, in other stores, it is being robbed. It is simple psychology, but it works.

To show how prevalent this practice has become, the Retail Merchants' Association made a survey during the 1930's and discovered no less than 284 items being sold below the wholesale cost as "loss leaders." There seems little doubt but that any losses so incurred are made up on our products once they have attracted the customer into the store.

These are examples of the methods being used by large-scale organizations to drive the small man out of the province.

We also must bear in mind the difficulties resulting from the release of commercial rent controls. This has forced many businessmen to give up. In some instances the rent has jumped as high as 400 per centum. and the small businews-man could not absorb it. You have seen many signs reading "Selling out" and "Going out of business." The government must bear its share of the blame for the disastrous conse-quences which followed the removal of commercial rent control. The large property owners profited and the small businessmen received another major blow.

I think I have said enough to indicate that these unfair

practises are extremely severe. While the small man endeavors to compete with the large chains, the majority of the small men are in a bad way and something must be done to help them.

I will now pass to the last point. What could this government do to helpthe small man in the province? Other provinces have tried passing Codes and very complicated laws and they have not worked out and I am not suggesting that. I did make three suggestions. I will ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) about that again. I want the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) to have publishedall available discounts, rebates, allowances, and so forth, and special allowances that each gave to anyone.

(Take C follows)

Make it mandatory to publish them, so that every businessman in the province will know he can get in on those allowances, if he buys collectively with other people.

Secondly, I want to ask the government to actively encourage the growth of co-operative agencies, or co-operative wholesale warehouses, if he wants to call them that. So the small men could pool their buying power, and by means of a scheme like that, they could compete on a paying basis with the large chain stores.

I am aware that this is not prohibited by law, but that is not good enough. I am asking the government to actively encourage the growth of such organizations. I am asking the government to lead the way.

Thirdly, -- and the most important of all -- I want to ask the government to establish a retailers' research and advisory council to study the problems of the retail trade and to aid retailers to protect themselves against unfair practices.

Such a council should, of course, work with retailers and their representatives, and it could render a great service to the small businessman. It could collect information on those unfair practices, and how to meet them. It could encourage the growth of co-operative buying agencies, it could gather information upon what is being done in other provinces.

Last Session I tried to introduce a resolution to the House on this matter, but I was prevented from doing so, because it involved the spending of government money. This year I am asking the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger), himself, for action of some kind. I shall like some answer from him during the Session. Other provinces have taken action,

notably British Columbia and Alberta, as has also the United States.

The problem is a vital one, and affects an important section of our economy. As legislators, we cannot ignore the duty of giving positive leadership in this field.

I am publishing and publicizing my own speech very widely, and I would be glad to publicize any answer given by the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger).

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) is finished on that particular subject; I did not want to interrupt him in the course of it, but if I may be permitted, may I say that I certainly do not agree that the large chain stores -- and I am thinking more particularly of retail grocery stores -- while they are beautiful to look at and capable of carrying tremendous quantities of goods, to a great extent which far surpass the individual operators of a grocery or meat shop, I, in general, with the exception of what you term "loss leaders" will say they do not undersell the efficiently-operated small business in this province.

When you consider the extra services that the individual retailer gives to his people, with a little credit here and there when it is urgently needed, the small operator does as good a job in this province as the larger ones, and he will be in business a long time.

Also, the small operators are banded together in a great many cases and purchase collectively. You will see a great many shops -- the Red and White Stores, for instance -- there are hundreds of them -- which operate on a collective basis, and secure those discounts of which you spoke.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): What is the trend,

Mr. Minister (Mr. Daley)?

MR. DALEY: I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion -- and I have had a very considerable experience in it -- the small retailer in this province is doing a good job, and could compete with the big stores.

MR. SALSBERG: What is the trend nationally? That is important.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Who is making the speech?

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr.Speaker, I would rise to a point of order --

MR. SPEAKER: I think we had better confine ourselves to questions which may be asked of the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) who has the floor, unless it is desirable to make a statement of absolute contradiction. If there are any questions, and the hon. member who has the floor (Mr. Scott, Beaches) wishes to give way to the question, and answer it, that is all very well, but I think we had better not have further interjections, unless they are direct corrections of a misstatement which has been made.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a correction --

MR. SPEAKER: No; I will not allow it.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I think the House should thank the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) for his fine contribution to the Throne Speech, but I think I should be permitted to finish without further interruption.

MR. DALEY: When you are being so careful to publicize your remarks to these retailers, tell them what I said, too.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I will. I want to precipitate

some kind of discussion on these problems. Unfortunately, the retail organizations do not agree with you. They do agree with me.

I do not say the smaller businesses are being wiped out wholesale right now, but that is the trend, and one thing that many of the small businessmen have found very hard is the fact they give credit, and go into debt doing it, or they make deliveries, which costs them about 5 percent. of their operating cost. Go around the city of Toronto, and see the huge chain stores being built up, and ask some of these people, and you will find out they are plenty worried.

MR. DALEY: I have been 26 years in the business --

MR. SALSBERG: You were glad to give it up, when you had the first chance.

MR. DALEY: No, I made more money then than I am making now.

MR. SALSBERG: You were glad to give it up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Maybe at the next election you will be able to go back to it.

Hon. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Did you ever think any of these people -- 42 years ago I was the Chairman --

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Is this another speech?

MR. DUNBAR: 42 years ago, before you were born, I was the chairman --

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Another speech, Mr. Speaker? Obviously there is some interest in this.

MR. DUNBAR: You will learn as you go along.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): You are not being --

MR. DUNBAR: You will learn, after you get the little scraps off.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, as I say, this is a problem concerning which obviously there are some strong opinions on both sides. All we want is some statement from the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger). The problem is there; are we going to do anything about it? That is all we want to know. That is the kind of an answer I want from the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger).

Mr. Speaker, so much for that particular subject. I want to go on for a few minutes now and deal with the problem of higher education in the Universities of this province. This is the subject to which I devoted almost my complete time last Session, and I did not get very much satisfaction from the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

The situation since I last spoke to the House has actually become much worse, and while I do not intend to deal with the whole problem of financing of Universities, I do want to go into that in some detail with the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), but I want to say just a few words now about the problem of scholarships and fees in the Universities, and about the difficulty the young people are experiencing when they try to go to the Universities of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the irony of the whole situation is that the young people of this province, who are most adversely affected by this problem, are your constituents right over there. It is the young people who live outside of Toronto, who live in the country and in the small towns who

are most adversely affected by this trend of higher education, when they want to get into the Universities of this province.

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (Addington): Not in my riding. My riding is better equipped with bus services to and from the high schools --

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Is this another speech, Mr. Speaker? I am going to quote you a remark by the president of Queen's University, which will indicate that the problem is just as severe in your end of the country as anywhere else.

Now, the trend is pretty black, and if this goes much further, many of our schools will go broke. All I want to touch upon this afternoon are the fees and the scholarships, and the lack of providing them in this province. In doing so, I want to speak of two things; first, the fees in this province are too high, to get an education, and secondly, there are not enough scholarships and bursaries.

These are the points I want to make and bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) this afternoon. I am one of those people who think that the academically-trained mind is an important part of our community, that those people who have access to higher education and academic training are very important to the development of the country, who will help mould educational policies, and help to decide the economic policies for the whole country. That includes the psychiatrists who are working in the mental hospitals, doctors in the field of health, engineers and other professional men, and I think you will agree that agricultural discoveries are made by people who have had access to academic training.

So all of the people of these professions are making contributions to the economy of the province.

Then, of course, there is the whole broader problem of democracy. It does not mean very much for our politicians to go around the country and talk about "democracy", when they come here and deny the very foundation of it. The foundation of democracy is a highly-educated electorate, and as the trend is we will not have them, in 10 or 15 or 20 years. The trend is that it is becoming increasingly difficult to get to the Universities of this province.

As I said last year, the fees in this province have risen and risen and risen, until they have reached what we might call the "saturation point". As a matter of fact, in the Star Weekly, for this coming week -- which is already on the news-stands -- there is a statement by R. C. Wallace, principal of Queen's University, in which he says:

> "The fees have been raised to the saturation point".

That means they cannot go higher, if the University is going to have people coming in and getting higher education.

Dr. Wallace goes on to say:

> "The fees are now at their limit in these comparatively good times. They will have to be lowered when times get bad."

Do not take my word for this, Mr. Speaker; there is the statement by the president of Queen's University, in which he says that the fees in this province are far too high, that we must not allow them to go much higher, because people simply cannot afford to attend the Universities.

One of the men who presented a brief to the Massey Commission stated that it cost $1,000. a year if an out-of-town

person is going to attend the University, and yet the highest bursary awarded by this government is for $400.

The group which is most affected by the increase in fees, or the groups, rather, -- as I have said earlier -- are the sons of working men and sons of farmers, and people coming from the smaller towns.

There was an article which appeared in the Globe and Mail on March 6th, 1950, entitled, "Deficit-Ridden Schools seeking Federal Help to meet Higher Costs", and in it, it refers to the national conference of Canadian Universities which represents such institutions and colleges from all of Canada -- all of Canada -- and the spokesman made the following statement to the Massey Commission:

> "The stream of young people from the rural areas and small towns is tending to dry up, because education costs are too high."

Then there is one in the Star Weekly, also, Mr. Speaker, which stated -- and this is Dr. Wallace again, the president of Queen's University:

> "While 25 years ago, 20 percent. or 25 percent. of Queen's students came from the farms, that number has now shrunk to six percent., and with farm prices dropping, it is going to be increasingly difficult for the farmers to send their sonsto college".

And is not Queen's somewhere down near the riding of Addington? Do not a lot of your constituents go there? Do you disagree with president Wallace?

MR. PRINGLE: I certainly do not, but the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) suggested that our people on this side

of the House had no opportunity for elementary education.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I suggested no such thing. That is simply not true. I suggested no such thing. All I am stating is -- and it does not alter my own opinion; the facts speak for themselves -- the trend in this province of people from the smaller towns and the farms are finding it increasingly difficult to go to the Universities, because it costs too much, and I would like to hear the hon. member (Mr. Pringle) make a speech which will deny that fact.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) a question?

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Yes.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) has asked for some facts. Does he want to have them now?

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): No, give them to me in your speech.

MR. PORTER: Whatever you wish. If you do not want the facts --

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I remember last year, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) made a speech back to me, in which he quoted some very fine figures, and when I analyzed them, I found they were completely distorted.

MR. PORTER: "Sez" you.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): It did not convey the impression you wanted it to at all.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I cannot allow that at all. I think no hon. member has any right to say another hon. member has actually distorted facts. I think that statement must be withdrawn. That is an implication which I cannot allow to

stand.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I will withdraw it; that is not --

MR. SPEAKER: I want an unqualified withdrawal, without any explanation.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Yes, I will withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches)withdraw the statement, please.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Yes. Then, I would want to go on and say to the rural hon. members, that I would like you -- in fact, I would urge you to urge the government to do something about this. If it is your constituents which are the most affected by this, perhaps more so than the people of the cities, you should exercise some pressure, I think, to rectify the situation, in spite of the emphasis which has been put upon it here. It is a very serious problem with which the people of this province are faced. If you do not believe me, go and ask them. Investigate it, and do something about it, if you can.

That brings me to the real point I am going to make to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), and that is, the source of help available for people who want to go to the Universities. First of all, the first source suggested to me by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) was that of chaps working their way through during the summer, and he eulogizes with some grandeur that method of working through the Universities. Today that is almost a ridiculous thing to suggest, in view of the existing unemployment, and the difficulty people are having in obtaining jobs in the summer. Even if it was not, an investigation by the students

themselves indicates the most they can usually save in the summertime is $400., and yet we have a situation where the cost is about $1,000. a year. How you are supposed to meet the difference between $400. and $1,000., I am not sure, because you cannot get any bursaries from this government to help them out.

The second suggestion as to assisting young people in going through Universities, was that of scholarships and bursaries, and here I come to the real indictment of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). I will not quote the Twenty-Two Points, but I will quote from his speech in the House on February 17th, 1950, where he said:

> "Education is not the privilege of any one group; it is the right of all our children. All those who have a direct or indirect interest in the educational system of Ontario can contribute by suggestions and criticism."

That is good philosophy, Mr. Speaker, and I thoroughly agree with it. The only thing I want to say is that this government is not carrying it out, and I want to point out to you why.

Last year I asked the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) what form of assistance this government was giving to the University students, and this was his reply, on page 725:

> "Dominion-Provincial bursaries are the only things of that kind, and I understand the University of Toronto also gives some assistance."

That is your assistance to people going through the Universities.

Let us look at these bursaries.

On page 714, the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) made a statement to me, in which he listed the extent of this assistance to students, and he said:

"In the years 1943 - 1944, this government gave 192 scholarships; in 1947 - 48, they gave 967 scholarships, and in 1948 - 49, they gave 1,000 scholarships",

and then he turned and suggested what a great job they were doing in higher education.

I obtained from the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) a breakdown of those figures about the 1,000 scholarships and I find that only 619 of them had anything to do with the University at all, and of these 619 only 158 was available for students in this province who want to enter the first year of University, that is, 158 in a province containing over 4,000,000 people.

Then I went on and found out how many of those scholarships had been granted since this government came into power, and I found in no year did the number exceed 166. There was 101, 141, 161, 166 --

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I clear up something at this point? The statement the hon. member (Mr. Scott - Beaches) is making is akin to saying that in this great province with 4½ million people, we are doing nothing to help the people attending the public and secondary schools. As a matter of fact, we are giving $41,000,000. The fact of the matter is, we are giving an additional 3½ million dollars to the universities.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Speaker --

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think it is only fair that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has the right to correct or clarify a statement. There is no question about that. Further, I will call the orders in this House, and

when the House gets out of order, as it did a few minutes ago, I will try and bring you back.

I want to be perfectly fair, but it has always been understood in the House that an hon. minister may clarify or correct a statement. The hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) did give way. But I must insist that I shall call the orders.

The hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) must sit down when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is making a clarification.

When order is to be called, please let me do it.

The hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) has the floor.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that the government is doing nothing in the way of education. Those steps will be adequately covered later on by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard). All I am speaking about now is the field of higher education.

MR. FROST: Then the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) should know that we are giving 3½ million dollars in direct grants to the universities that we gave 3½ million dollars in direct grants to the universities last year.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I know, and I will come to that in time.

If I may go on, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that in no year have the number of scholarships given to people entering the first of the university exceeddd 166. That is all the help you are giving to the universities and colleges, by way of scholarships and bursaries in this province. If the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) can bring in other figures, I would be very glad to hear them.

MR. FROST: Have you noticed over on the grounds of the University of Toronto that great Walberg Building? Every dollar for that building was provided by this government.

If that is not helping the University students, I do not know what is. There they have first, second, third and fourth year students. The whole building was paid for by this government.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I would like to try and finish this within the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker, if I can.

As I was saying -- and I repeat -- the scholarships and bursaries to the students of this province have not exceeded more than 166 in any one year. That is a bad thing when there are many students who want to go to college, but never get the chance.

I did intend to read to the House the form these people have to fill out to get the scholarships, but I will not do it, because there is not time.

I am not quarrelling with the questions you ask in this form, but you go into every single financial opportunity these people might have for bringing in a little money, their whole background, how much money they have, how much their fathers are making, and where they might get help, and if they cannot get help, and can show it, then you ask the final question, and if they have shown you they cannot get help, then their names go on a list, and from that list you take 158 or 160 and give them bursaries, but the rest do not get them.

That is, after all, Mr.Speaker, nothing but a means test. You investigate their whole financial background, and even if they prove they cannot go on without these bursaries they do not get them.

MR. FROST: Why not?

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I am objecting to questions being

asked now. You can make your objection when I have finished my statement.

When they prove they cannot go to school without them, then you make up a list, and award the bursaries. But, may I ask, how many are refused bursaries, because you are not giving enough of them?

In 1943 you received 211 applications, and you granted 101. This is from your return to me last year, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter).

In the year 1944-45, you got 266 applications, and you granted 141. Those are to people desiring to enter the first year university.

In 1945-46, you got 360 applications, and you granted 161.

In 1946-47, you received 332 applications, and you granted 166.

In 1947-48, you received 441 applications, and again you granted 158.

And in the year 1948-49 you received 493 applicatio s, and you granted 158.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happens to all thos s students who do not get bursaries? They have all filled out the forms, they have all proven they cannot get higher education without some financial assistance, but what happens to them? In my submission they never get to the university, the people who are in this position, never get into the university at all.

I want to urge upon the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to do something about it at this Session. If you will, I will be the first person to rise and congratulate you. It is a serious problem. Do not be afraid to let the young people become educated. Let the young people of this province go

as far as they can in higher education, and the community will be well repaid for it.

Last year, when I brought this subject up, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) rose in his seat and asked me if I had thought of the cost of increasing those bursaries. I replied that the cost of a bursary was an investment, rather than a cost. I want to cite one statement recently made, that "higher education is an investment not a cost; it is an investment in social welfare, better living standards, better health and less crime. It is an investment in higher production, increased income and great efficiency in agriculture, industry and in government.

"It is an investment in the bulwark against garbled information, half truths, and untruths, and against ignorance and intolerance. It is an investment in better home relationships, in democracy and in peace."

That is the kind of an investment I want you to make. Sure, it will cost a little bit of money, but it will pay big dividends, and those are the kinds of dividends that the young people of this province, and in fact, I think all of the people of this province would like to see.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DONALD BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue this debate, I am glad that on this occasion, different to last year, you are in your chair, and I can direct one or two remarks to you.

The Deputy-Speaker was in the House when I was speaking, but now I want to express to you my personal congratulations upon the very impartial manner which you conduct the debates in this House.

Last year I thought that the hon. member for Ottawa South (Mr. Dunbar) on a few occasions did get out of control, even out of your control, but I think possibly this year you have been able to handle him better, and now I sort of miss his jumping up and down, and entering into the debates spontaneously.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

(Take D-1 follows)

I would like also to express my own personal regret at the absence in this House of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) and of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell), and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault). The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) was to me, in the first year I was a member of this Legislature, a very kind friend and adviser, and I am sure I am voicing the thoughts of many others that we certainly miss him here and hope for his speedy return to health. I was also glad to hear of that great co-operation between the hon. member for York and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett). I do not know whether it foreshadows other events in the future, but at least I am thinking quite seriously of trying to bring the influence of the hon. member for York with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to bear in my behalf.

Down in my constituency we have separating those two, or substantially joining those two great counties, highway 41, in the midst of which is the Bay of Quinte. At the present time there is absolutely no way that a vehicle can cross the Bay of Quinte on Highway 41. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is not in the House, because I hoped in the program he outlined the other day, he could afford a free ferry or any kind of a ferry to join that highway. As it is now, it jumps the water and starts again, and I had hoped something could be done there.

I do not want to sound too agreeable this afternoon, but I am almost in a mood to agree with the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) in that expression he used, the two words, "flexible thought". Last year, as you no doubt remember, on a few occasions the then acting leader of the House (Mr. Frost) on a number of occasions mentioned how

when he was in need of advice, . . went down to Lindsay and there he talked with Old Man Ontario. I tried to persuade him Old Man Ontario did not live there at all, that he lived down in the cradle of this province, the home of the United Empire Loyalists, on the Bay of Quinte. I could not do it here, but last fall he journeyed up from the battle of Leeds one evening to open a new school, which we very much appreciated.

MR. SALSBERG: The school was what?

MR. BAXTER: On the platform, before 400 or 500 people of the County of Lennox, he admitted quite frankly that that was the birth of civilization in Ontario, that was where Ontario really got its start. I was able to point out to these people that at least he admitted that Old Man Ontario really did live down there.

I must say this in all fairness, because I do not think that the purpose of the Debate on the Speech from the Throne is entirely to be critical. I believe there is plenty of room for it, but at the same time, I do feel I must be fair to him, as the hon. Premier of this province, in telling this. I was in Ottawa at the opening of the Dominion-Provincial conference a few months back, and I was proud, Mr. Speaker, to be a member of the Legislature of Ontario and a member of the Province of Ontario, when I heard and saw the feeling of optimism that pervaded these creators of Parliament, as they were preparing to open that Dominion-Provincial conference, that feeling that pervaded that group there, alone, because of the calibre and character of the man who was speaking on behalf of the people of the Province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BAXTER: There are times when politics must go out the window, and that time I certainly was proud in that it was quite evident that he, by his presence there, and the speeches he made prior to that conference, was extending the hand of good will to not only the old provinces, but the new province as well. I do hope as he goes to the conferences that follow that he, on behalf of this province, gives the leadership which this wealthiest province in this Dominion must needs give for social security and all those others which we must have in order to go forward. I do think that we, are in the responsible position at this time, Mr. Speaker, whereby we, as the wealthiest province, must take the leading step. I do not expect he will, and I do not want him to sell Ontario short, but at the same time, I do feel that he who represents this province must be prepared to lead the way in order to make possible these great advances in social security and welfare that we all desire, on all sides.

That brings me to the third thought I have, and that is the trouble I am finding among members of the county councils for the province of Ontario. I have two county councils in my riding, one in Lennox and one in Prince Edward, and I do find that members of the county councils in that area are becoming more and more confused as the days go by at where their responsibilities and their authority starts, and where it leaves off. They are finding grants coming from the province, grants in some cases that ease the tax burden, grants which because of other details, add to the tax burden. The main thing, however, is they are finding that their authority in a good many cases is being sharply curtailed. In one instance, we have a health unit down there which is doing a good job. I find no criticism of it, but we are finding that inasmuch as it is directed from head-

quarters in Toronto, that there is a lot of dis-harmony and even men in the councils down there are beginning to think if they do not take a step on the issues up there they should throw the health unit out, because they have no authority.

I also read that in the counties of Durham and Northumberland, represented by hon. members across the way, that one of their hon. members at the September Session suggested abolition of county councils. He said he thought that they had outlived their usefulness. I suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, the most representative form of government which we have and the one which is closest to the people, and the one which is the most democratic, is the county council. They have a very vital job to do, and they keep the people interested in the affairs of the municipality, , they give them a chance once each twelve months to speak in the democratic way by voting as to whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied. I do feel it is quite important, as has been suggested several times in this House, that the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost), as soon as it is possible at all, should summon a provincial-municipal corference to work out these problems because surely, together, they can be worked out.

I am sorry, this afternoon, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is not in the House. I had one or two notes I wanted to speak on, coming as I do from an agricultural constituency. In recent years, since 1946, and in the last Session and this Session, there has been very progressive legislation in the form of a Farm Products Marketing Act being brought into being, and it is very beneficial and necessary for the farmers for the marketing of their produce. It is very beneficial to the farmers of this province, and it controls the marketing policies and the financial well-being

of those concerned. There is, however, this feeling, which I believe was mentioned by some of the hon. members opposite the other day, and that is that use could be made of this marketing legislation which will cause them to build a price structure within the province that, in turn, builds a barrier around this province, a barrier to national or international trade. In other words, there is a possibility that Ontario, through the legislation that we have today, will find that our product is priced so high it has to stay within this pro ince. I am thinking possibly more particularly of the vegetable business, and the vegetable marketing business particularly, because I am associated with that to some extent, and I do find that because of the fact that we have this marketing scheme in Ontario and r sister province of Quebec has no marketing scheme, the products of Quebec are coming in and competing very easily on the markets of this province to the detriment of the Ontario farmer.

Now, I am not suggesting we should keep out Quebec produce, I am suggesting the farmer should have a good, fair return for his work in this province of Ontario. But I am suggesting that there is a possibility that if they get these prices for their materials too high, that they will find in this province that a wall, a trade barrier,has been built around the province, which will make it impossible for us to ship any of these products out, and it will make us much more susceptible to the other products coming in, with the result that production will be curtailed. You may say, "What can be done?" Well, we have a very good agricultural college, several of them in this province, and I do feel it is quite necessary for the Department of Agriculture, through its

educational and extension agencies, to give to the farmers every possible help and guidance in their marketing problem, to keep them abreast of the markets in Ontario and to educate them, not only in this province, but in other parts of the Dominion and throughout the world. If they are not given guidance at this time, when they are given this new, powerful legislation, they may well arrive at a point where there will be no need of any production because there will be no market for the production. I do not want to sound blue or gloomy, because I think our agricultural standard in this province is good, I think the future is bright. But I do feel that the farmers will have to be given guidance, and it is the responsibility of our Department of Agriculture of this province to give them that guidance. The farmers are not always seeking guidance, because there is a lot of guidance for them today which they do not seek.

There is a soil analyst at Guelph whose findings would be very beneficial to all farmers, but the number of those that use it is very small indeed. This is simply, I think, because there is not impressed upon them the importance of that work, and they do not use it.

I would say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and to his department that it is their responsibility that this Legislature should see to it that guidance is given. In the best methods of production, in order that our cost of production may be lowered, in order that prices may go down to meet outside competition, because we have that problem now. Just to mention one, we are able to buy in this province California peaches a lot cheaper than the peaches grown in the Niagara area.

I have a word or two about the Department of Welfare which I feel is very well handled by the present hon. Minister

of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). I do feel -- perhaps I am speaking out of turn -- but I do feel that the time is rapidly coming, Mr. Speaker, for a contributory form of old age pensions.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BAXTER: I do feel we have come to the point where we have to face it, Mr. Speaker, and, possibly will have to take the leadership in stepping out and demanding that because of the increasing social services demand, with the greater need about us, we must have a plan of old-age pensions that is going to be workable and is going to be carried on for future ganerations.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Do you favour the means test?

MR. BAXTER: I am hopeful that we can soon see the day when there is abolition of the means test because I have found -- in all fairness I must say,-- it has inflicted a great deal of hardship on quite a number of people, and if we are going to have real social security that should be done. That is in the future still. Some may think because I am sitting so close to my friends here that I have gone over into their ranks, but I want to say also that a great deal has been said about free enterprise. I want to say, as one who believes implicitly in free enterprise -- I have not changed my views -- but I do want to say I feel there is an obligation, there is a responsibility here, on the part of free enterprise, to take cognizance of the welfare of all ranks of society, and if they do not do that, problems such as the unemployment problem which is existing possibly in not too big a way, but it is still there, if we do not do that, then free enterprise will not have the right to flourish and continue to carry on in this democracy of Ontario. I am not too happy when I go to

bed at night to think of these unemployed men in our hostels in all parts of this province, and I do feel, as a democracy, as a province and a Dominion standing for the freedom of the individual and the freedom of enterprise, it seems to me we must be prepared to map out plans and to carry through plans that will try to maintain as high a level and as even a level of employment as we possibly can. In this world today, man is becoming increasingly aware of his obligation as his brother's keeper, and we cannot hope to continue to have this democratic way of life which we get,with all the freedoms which we get, if there is that certain portion of our society to which we do not offer any great hope of betterment of their conditions.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I know that generally when I get up to speak, some of my friends over here and in other parts of the House expect I will have something to say on the temperance problem. Indeed, I do miss the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) because last year he seemed to be quite happy when I stood up and was interested in trying to kid me along. In connection with that, I was very interested to read in the paper last night, in the Toronto Daily Star, where Professor Joselyn Rogers of the government department, stated that women's beverage rooms were a breeding-place for crime, and that auto accidents were fifty per cent attributable to drunken driving. I was very happy when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his Cabinet appointed the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote) to the Liquor Control Board to investigate a report on certain methods in other countries of the world. I am sorry he is not here, because I have great faith in his interest in the young people of this land, and in the problem which the liquor industry presents today to these young people as they start out in life. I hope he will carry forth some

procedure of education that at least will give them a fifty-fifty chance against the inroads of that problem.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just say as I said a few minutes ago, they do not need to look at me and say, "Lead kindly light, amid the encircling gloom", there is not gloom in me about the future of this province.

I do feel, as in wartime, all ranks represented by education, industry, agriculture, and so on, should go back to the very prodigious effort that was needed during the war. I feel if we are going to have peace, the need for cooperation between agriculture, industry, labour and government is even greater than it was before in this House. Last Session I pleaded with my friends on my right hand to be as fair and as generous with the dairy industry as they could be, in their approach to the margarine question.

Last January, I had the opportunity and was invited to attend meetings of various groups of farmers in my constituency in relation to the falling prices and disappearance of the overseas market. I had one particular person who said, "I would recommend to this meeting", and he attended every meeting he could get to, "I would recommend a buyers' strike". He said, "We have to hit at industry". I got up at both of these meetings, and I said, "My friends, I would just say to you that in a buyers' strike the person you are hitting hardest is labour, you should get to realize that the purchaser of the farm products, to a large extent, are the men and women of labour throughout this province." We cannot have them bickering, we cannot have them with that feeling between them. There must be co-operation, and I do hope that our deliberations will have a spirit of co-operation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, in

rising to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I would like to follow the time-honoured practice of complimenting the mover and second of the reply to the Speech from the Throne. The speeches delivered by the mover and seconder represented a good deal of preparation, and in the presentation, little was left to be desired.

I would also like to compliment the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on his elevation to his important office, and to reiterate what has already been stated, that it is a pleasure indeed to serve under a leader so congenial and so ready to co-operate. Like others who have spoken, I would like to express my regret at the absence of some of the hon. members of this Legislature. I would like expecially to mention the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault). I feel that our French-Canadian hon. members of this Legislature, irrespective of which side of the House they sit on, have a very definite contribution to make, and I feel the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault) who represented Labour, as a member of one of the large unions, may have made a very definite contribution to this Legislature.

I know it is customary for hon. members of the more remote constituencies, when speaking in this House, to refer in particular to their own ridings, and draw to the attention of the administration what their respective problems may be. This I have attempted to do on several previous occasions, and I suppose I might continue from where I left off last year and extol the glories of Renfrew county, the second largest in area in the province, and one which, I believe, has a great deal to offer to the aggregate of the province of Ontario.

I might say, we have been very pleased in the last year to have a good many hon. members of this Legislature pay us a visit in Renfrew county and see for themselves, first-hand, what we have to offer. A great many hon. members coming down there had preconceived ideas that all we had was forest and power sites. I might describe in some detail the scenic beauty as you drive down the route leading from North Bay down through the Ottawa Valley. I might describe in some detail the gigantic hydro development on the upper Ottawa River, where soon will be produced nearly 1 million additional horsepower in electrical energy to supply the industrial needs of Ontario.

I would like to tell you something of our farming districts, our agricultural districts, as we go further down the valley. I think we take our quota of prizes at the Royal Winter Fair. We supply most of the peas you see on your menus all over Ontario, as the Ottawa Valley peas. We have a great lumbering industry in the upper Ottawa Valley. For those who have not had the pleasure of taking that long drive down there, it would really be worthwhile to pay us a visit, next year or as soon as it is possible.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debates presented so far in this House. One listens to the discussions pro and con, and he is left in a quandary. On the one hand, we, here, are government criticized for being too lavish in their expenditures; on the other hand we hear some of the hon. members draw to our attention that the provisions made for welfare and education, etc., have been totally inadequate.

I was particularly impressed with the speech made by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). As one looks at this rugged individual, it is hard to picture him as

eking out a livelihood against the rocks of Grey County, but I believe he represents South Grey, where the task of making a living is not so difficult or precarious. I do appreciate some of the statements he made and his thinking is something along the same lines as my own, although it may be expressed a little better.

I felt that the admonition offered to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was very timely. I feel that there is a tendency, a growing tendency on the part of people of this province to look to the government for a solution of all their problems instead of putting forward a genuine effort of their own to help themselves. I think there is danger in going too far with paternal legislation, and I think, while it is a very definite responsibility of this government to solve the problems of the farmers of this province, and to take up some of the slack, I think people, as a whole, can do more to help themselves than they have actually tried to do.

I would like to deal very briefly with a few things that have been accomplished by this government during the last few years. I would like to ask the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) in passing, whether he thinks we should do some of this slashing or lopping-off in our estimates. Last year, I believe it was, we put through a Community Halls Act making it possible, through the Department of Agriculture, to have community halls for the provision of open-air rinks, covered rinks, athletic fields, and other things of this nature throughout the province. Hundreds of centres, rural and urban as well, have taken advantage of this assistance, and it has made it possible for a great many of these small centres to provide good, clean sport for the boys and girls, the young people in these sections, and keep them from congregating in

the larger centres. I do not think the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) would want to see any reduction in these grants. Personally, I would like to see every assistance granted, especially in our small communities and in large rural sections, where it is financially impossible for our taxpayers to bear any greater burden in order to make provision for centres of this nature.

Then, if I may turn to education, I listened with interest to what the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) had to say about higher education. I think the provision made for primary and secondary education is equally important. The grants for educational purposes have increased by many millions of dollars since 1943. Increased grants to give assistance for the building of schools, the payment of teachers, and the improvement of our educational system, generally, has made it possible for our smaller municipalities to provide better educational facilities and give our teachers and trainers something that more nearly approaches a living wage. We have seen the result of that, more especially, I think, in eastern Ontario, or, east of Toronto, where we have a great many municipalities with a very low assessment, where the mill rate is high, and where it has been impossible for them to increase their salaries, or improve their schools. I might say, in some of these sections the grant is as high as ninety per cent, which is a very substantial contribution. I do not think anyone here would agree that our teachers are over-paid.

Our boys and girls constitute the greatest asset we have in this province, and I think there has been a tendency on the part of people, particularly from our rural sections, to bear expenditures to improve the quality of our livestock, and at the same time to be very reluctant to provide

better educational facilities for our children, who will be the men and women of tomorrow.

(Take E follows)

As I said last year, I think the money that is spent for educational purposes should not be considered as an expenditure at all, but simply as an investment in the greatest asset we have in this province.

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HUNT: I do not think the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) thinks for a moment we should cut down on the assistance we afford to our schools and our school boards generally throughout this province. I think the Bill passed last year provided some measure of security for our retired teachers, or those still engaged in the profession, and will have a tendency to correct the shortage of teachers in this province. There has been a dearth of teachers, more particularly in the rural sections. A number of teachers who were away from teaching for a number of years have seen fit to fill up the gap, and try to substitute until the new teachers are prepared to begin teaching. I think any money spent by this government through the Department of Education in the way of scholarships or bursaries will offer some inducement to the youth of this province to go through the Universities and Colleges, and it will be money well invested.

Then, if we turn to the Department of Health, we see that a great deal has been done in the way of making larger grants towards the building and equipping of hospitals, more especially in the smaller centres. We have in the little village of Barries Bay, in Renfrew County, a campaign at the present time to raise a considerable amount of money to provide a hospital which will serve a district remote from the larger centers in that part of the province. By receiving these increased grants, both provincially and federally, it

will enable them to provide something better for the health of the people than they have ever had before, something that is long over-due, and I am sure that all the hon. members of this Legislature were pleased to hear that an increase in grants was to be made, and that further assistance was to be given toward the building and equipping of these small hospitals, especially in smaller centers, where they are so urgently needed.

Then, briefly, turning to the Department of Highways, I would like to commend the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) for what he has done in the last few years to assist the farmers of this province, especially those living on the back concessions. We know that main traffic arteries are very necessary in this province, and they cost a lot of money, but I feel -- and I am sure a great many of the hon. members of this House feel -- that there has been a tendency for a great many years to forget the men who happened to live back off the highways with their small, narrow townships roads, and county roads.

Our present hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has done a great deal to correct this in the last few years. He has brought the grants for culverts and bridges up to 80 percent. of the amount they will cost.

I listened to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) say that something more should be done for the farmers on the back concessions, but I do not know whether he knew just what assistance was being given to them at this time. Of all the monies spent by the counties throughout the Province of Ontario, 50 percent. of it is subsidized from the Treasury of this Province. In our township, of all the monies expended, these subsidies range all the way

from 50 percent. to as high as 90 percent., in some of the unorganized townships.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say a great deal has been done to improve our county roads and township roads, and I feel these are just as important as the others, because they are the feeders which supply the main arteries.

But our hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has gone farther than that. He initiated a road system, whereby some of our poorer counties, and our townships, have been relieved of the responsibility of building some of these roads. The Department of Highways will, in some cases, enter into an agreement with the council of the municipality, whereby they will take over certain sections of the road, and bring it up to the standard, and then turn it back to the municipality. This has made it possible for a great many townships of low assessments to bring up their township roads to a much better standard than they were a few years ago.

In connection with highways, there is one other point I would like to mention. I think it is the desire of all the hon. members, especially hon. members from the urban constituencies, who are not perhaps as conversant with the subject as some of us who live in the rural sections. The cost of roads today is a very different problem than it was a few years ago. Then a man could go out with a team of horses, and throw up an embankment on each side, and it served as a road, which would take care of the traffic of that time. Now, it requires a great deal of heavy machinery, and it would be almost out of the question for many of these small municipalities to operate equipment of that kind

on the roads.

By the formation of what I believe they call "municipal machinery pools", they have made it possible to have this heavy machinery made available to the smaller municipalities at a nominal charge, so that they can go ahead and use up-to-date, modern equipment to build the roads, without having to spend these tremendous sums of money, which otherwise they would have to spend. I think is worthy of some commendation, and I think it is something which originated with the present hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett).

They have formed a machinery pool at Bancroft, which is one of our highway centers in eastern Ontario, and a lot of machinery has been sent there in my own riding, and leased out to those municipalities with low assessments at a nominal charge, which I do not know will eventually even pay the initial cost of the machinery, but it saves the municipalities having to buy this heavy machinery, and while they pay the operating costs, at least the machinery is available.

Now, turning to Hydro: when I came into this House, in 1943, we had very little Hydro in Renfrew County. At that time I drew to the attention of the hon. members that we had hamlets -- some of them unincorporated, and some of them incorporated villages -- which were entirely dependent upon the use of the old kerosene lamps. I am happy to report now that every hamlet in Renfrew County has been taken care of since 1943. I may go farther and say that a greater part of the rural people have been provided with Hydro service. We have not got all we asked for, nor all we hoped for, and I do hope, and I feel that something more will be done.

We feel in Renfrew County that it is coming to the people because of the generating development we have for power on the Ottawa River. Within the next year or two, we will be generating about one million horsepower on the Ottawa River, at three large plants, and it would be rather hard to explain to the people down there that power was not available, more especially after these developments are completed and are generating at full capacity.

I would like to draw to the hon. Minister's(Mr. Challies) attention that we still have two little villages -- not in Renfrew County but in Nipissing, but attached to my county at election time -- which would like to be taken care of. We have the high tension line from Des Joachims to Huntsville, passing through these villages, and it would be difficult to tell these people that it would cost too much money to put in a substation, so they could have power, when it is passing right in front of their doors.

We are very appreciative of what has been accomplished in the last few years, and we are very grateful for what we have received.

I have heard a great deal since I came here first, in 1943, about the advantages of the decentralization of industry in this province. That has been of keen interest to me. I cannot see the sense of building up our great metropolitan areas, and aggravating the congestion or difficulty, which are already acute.

We know something about the situation adjacent to Toronto, and we know something of what your problems are here, and when we have so much to offer right adjacent to the Ottawa River in the way of good, industrial sites, at little or no cost, what with the natural resources in that locality, we

cannot see why goods cannot be manufactured there.

We have a lot of good people who could be engaged as employees in industry, if we had the industries located there, and I think that the Hydro Commission, or the government of Ontario, might offer some inducement to industry to locate in that section, by offering cheaper power at the source of generation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HUNT: I believe the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), if he were in his place, would agree with me, because I saw, a week or two ago, where this matter was discussed pro and con, at the Hydro convention, and there were a great many people who held that opinion.

We know it costs a great deal of money to build these high-tension transmission lines over long distances, and there is a considerable loss through leakage in transporting this power, but I think from an economic standpoint we could well afford to offer power at a cheaper cost at the source of generation, and so bring about a tendency to de-centralize a lot of industries now located in the larger centres, which already are too large.

I do not think I will take up any more time, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and discuss the Department of Welfare, as some of the previous speakers have done, and pointed out how admirably that Department has been handled by the present hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). I do not think there have been very many neglected. I would agree with the hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Baxter) in hoping that the time will come when our welfare problems will be dealt with by a contributory scheme. I think it will come to that sooner or later, and I think it is the only sound way of handling it.

I could go on to some of the other departments, but I do not propose to do so today.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I only want to say that in spite of the criticism offered by some all the hon. members of the Opposition, -- and I suppose it is their duty to criticize, whether they believe it or not -- I think the program of this government has been fairly good, and I believe has been of tremendous benefit to the people of Ontario generally.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HARRY WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

On Monday, we will go ahead with government orders, It may be that the Marriage Bill will be called on Monday, and there will be other government items. If we have an opportunity on Monday, I should like to have a few more addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, may I ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)?

Do you believe it would be possible to speed up yet more the replies to the questions on the Order Paper? There are some questions there which I am sure the hon. members would like to have answered before we get into the Budget Debate. Sort of a bit of ammunition, as it were.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to give my hon. friends all the ammunition I can. There is so little I can give them.

However, I will look the questions over. I thought, in fact, I had done very well on this, and the hon. members opposite would be moving a vote of thanks to me for being so prompt in giving answers to the questions.

MR. MILLARD: It is an improvement, anyway.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.43 o'clock p.m.

- - - - - -

F O U R T H E R R A T A .

Vol 10; Page A-7; Line 4: Change "MR. SPEAKER" to "MR. PORTER".

- - - - -

Page E-6,
Vol. 11: Lines 2, 10, and 15: Change "MR. JOHNSTON" to "MR. VILLENEUVE".

- - - - - -

Vol. 11: Line 12: Page E-2: Change "Member for Huron(Mr. Pryde)" to "Member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Hanna)".

Line 13: Change "food" to "feed".
Line 14: Change "crucial" to "critical".

Page E-5; line 7: Change "me" to "it".

Page E-6; line 20: After "boys came" insert "home".
Page E-8; line 16: After "in this province are" delete "in the sticks" and substitute therefor, "in a squeeze between labour and industry".
Page E-10: line 22: After "they" insert "did not".
Line 23: Change "made" to "paid".
Page E-11: Line 20: Change "stuff" to "livestock".
Page F-1; line 19: Change "promised" to "a very large".
Line 22: Change "arrangements" to "reports".
Page F-2: line 12: Change "donations" to "switching charge, or an increase of".
Page G-1, line 2: change "Act" to "Part".
Page G-2; line 4: change "you" to "we".

- - - - - - -

Vol. 11: Page C-6; line 11: Change "capital" to "capitalism".

Page C-7; line 1: Change "left" to "kess."
Page C-8: line 25: Change "general" to "genuine".
Page C-10; line 13: Change "1945" to "1935".
Page D-1; line 29: change "presenting" to "preparing".
Page D-11; line 29; change "Prices of Bread" to "Combine".

- - - - - - -

Vol. 14: Page C-2; lines 12-13: Change "30,000,000 horsepower" to $30,000,000.00."
Page A-16; line 10; change "pressing" to "praising.
Page A-17: 4th line; change "government" to "monopoly".
Page B-5; line 5: change "$30.00" to "$50.00".
Page B-7:line 18; change "11 per 1000" to "7 per 1000".
Page B-8; line 30: delete "more than 450,000" and substitute therefor, "not more than 250,000."

Volume 18.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS THIRTEENTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT THREE O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Monday, March 13, 1950
3.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: May I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the hon. members to the fact that there are some twenty who have not as yet turned in their Income Tax exemption forms. The deadline for this is the end of this week. If any of the hon. members who are married, like myself, want to be classified as single taxpayers, that is perfectly all right, but we do wish you would take care of the filing of these Income Tax exemption forms which were put on your desks a week or so ago, at the very earliest opportunity.

Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

PREPAID HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. WM. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Would the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) give an explanation, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I do that without being asked, now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: This Act provides for the registration and supervision by the Department of Insurance of associations incorporated for the purpose of establishing, maintaining and operating a hospital or medical service on a non-profit prepayment basis, whereby any one or more of the hospital,

medical, surgical, nursing or dental services or payment therefor may be provided to persons who become subscribers or members of such associations.

MR. TEMPLE: Very disappointing.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to advise the hon. members that I spent this morning with hon. Russell Kelley (Minister of Health). I found him ever so much better, greatly improved, and able to get out of bed a little while every morning, and again in the afternoons, and he was as cheerful and happy as one could expect under the circumstances.

I wanted to be sure, because I had heard such gloomy reports about him, but I found him cheery and better than I had ever thought to see him.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That is indeed very good news. Is there any information concerning the health of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell)?

MR. KENNEDY: He is doing extremely well. To show how sick hon. Mr. Kelley (Minister of Health) must have been, he even spoke nicely about the hon. members opposite.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): That shows he must be feeling better.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 3, 57, 58, and 63.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Third readings. Order No. 1.

THE TOWN OF PORT HOPE AND TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the Town of Port Hope and Trinity College School", Mr. Foote.

MR. J. W. FOOTE (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the Town of Port Hope and Trinity College School".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton", Mr. Easton.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur", Mr. Robinson.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson), I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 6.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

CENTRAL CANADA EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting Central Canada Exhibition Association", Mr. Morrow.

MR. D. H. MORROW (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting Central Canada Exhibition Association".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

YOUNG MEN'S AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION -- BORDER CITIES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations", Mr. Murdoch.

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

MOUNT HAMILTON BRANCH, CANADIAN LEGION AND SALVATION ARMY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of

Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting Mount Hamilton Branch, Canadian Legion and Salvation Army", Mr. Thornberry.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting Mount Hamilton Branch, Canadian Legion and Salvation Army".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, third reading of Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act", Mr. Challies.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act".

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I would like to address two questions to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

First of all, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has had the opportunity to look up the reference to the amendment made to section 2 in 1947, as he promised to do, when the question was raised on second reading? That is the first question.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, is this: when I rose the other day to discuss section 2, which is being amended by this Bill, it was suggested to me that I was out of order. It was not pressed, and I was permitted to say what I had to say with, I may say, the assistance of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) who supported my view that I was quite

in order. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that you were not the arbiter as you were not in the Chair at the time.

But the point I now raise is this; it seems to me that the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Challies) who is vice-chairman of Hydro, is simply not available to this House for questions, unless a particular Bill happens to be before us at the moment. I consider that a very unfortunate circumstance, because there are many occasions from Session to Session when an hon. member of the Assembly would want to raise questions and receive replies from the hon. minister (Mr. Challies).

I would suggest to the government that they might very well put a one dollar or a five-dollar item in the estimates covering the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Challies), so that the work can be discussed in this House when the estimates are up, in the same way that we discuss those of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and so on, and so forth.

He is an hon. member of the government; he is drawing emolument from the government, for being the Minister, and it seems to me he should be held strictly accountable, the same as the other hon. ministers.

I suggest that, because if we are going to be called to order every time we raise a question affecting Hydro, I think the hon. members of the House will feel very much frustrated, and I would invite the views of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on these two points.

May I say that if he has not had the opportunity of looking up the reference in Hansard of 1947, I have done the necessary research for him, and will send him a copy now.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I did not have the opportunity of reading that speech this weekend, but I can assure my hon.

friend (Mr. MacLeod) that I will take the very first available opportunity to read it.

MR. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): You have it in your hand now.

MR. FROST: I, however, looked up the Act which was passed in 1947. It is a very brief Act, and it provides that the Commission shall, for all purposes, continue to be a body corporate, and consist of not more than nine members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

I again say there are three members on this Commission now, and I have given no thought to the matter of increasing the number. I may alter that, Mr. Speaker, in the future. As to that, I cannot say.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does not mind my asking, did he give any thought to the matter when the government decided to make it nine?

MR. FROST: Of course, I thought about it at that time, as apparently did other hon. members, and seemingly their thoughts were the same as mine, at the present time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: We will come to that question in the fullness of time, and give it great consideration.

As regards the other point, Mr. Speaker; I have no desire in any way to limit the right of hon. members to get the fullest information. The fact that I sat for many years on the other side, makes me know it is altogether good and proper that hon. members of this House should have the fullest information. That is one of the important features in a democratic government.

As regards the other point; I doubt if the mere introduction of a Bill relating to a certain special matter, will open up that particular subject for a complete discussion. To think that, I think is going pretty far. I think my hon.

friend (Mr. MacLeod) will agree with that.

After all the purpose of discussion on second reading of any Bill or in Committee is on the principle of the Bill itself on second reading, and the details with respect to the Bill, when in Committee.

The other day I did not have any objection to my friend (Mr. MacLeod) asking the question, although I really thought it did not concern the principle of the Bill. I think any discussion of these matters might be held at other times, such as when the estimates are brought down, when all these things can be considered.

I recognize that the Hydro Electric Power Commission is a matter of great public concern, and I think the fullest information which can be given should be given about it. I do not believe any restriction from the standpoint of asking any questions should be declared out of order, and I do not raise that today with respect to my friend's question in regard to the Act of 1947.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, that does not quite answer my question. I am quite prepared to agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that it is improper to discuss a whole Act when a specific matter is before the House, but how are we going to get around the problem of discussing Hydro in this House when that Department does not appear in the estimates? Is there not some way of setting up the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Challies) in the estimates, so we can discuss him, at least once a year?

MR. FROST: There is a question there in connection with rural power. On the estimates, there have never been any restrictions, the items there offer every opportunity for the widest discussion, and I should think when that matter

comes up, the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) as well as the other hon. members, will have every opportunity to make any statements they wish in relation to Hydro, generally.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is that in the Treasury Department estimates?

MR. FROST: I think they are in the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) having sat in Opposition, will appreciate this is a very real problem, and a serious problem. Under our Constitution, the theory is that when the House goes into Supply there is an opportunity afforded to all hon. members to scrutinize and discuss the proposed expenditures of the government, and that is a principle of great importance to us. It is many hundreds of years old, and has had the test of time, and on the whole, it has worked very well.

In regard to a great public enterprise like Hydro -- and that is one only; there is the Ontario Northland and a number of others -- some of us here think these are more important than some of the departments of government. Perhaps the matter was overlooked, or perhaps nobody has yet devised the satisfactory machinery for meeting the need, but it seems to me we should have the same power of scrutinizing and discussion over these independent boards and commissions, as we would have if they were departments of government.

I have no doubt the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) felt the same way about it when he was in opposition.

I suggest the government should give some consideration and try and find a better method for discussing these matters than in the incidental estimates, like rural hydro, which may appear in the estimates.

After all, it is an essential part of the scheme of things that not only should there be items in the estimates, but that the hon. minister responsible should be there, and should be answerable for what does appear in his department, or his board.

(Take B follows)

MR.E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): It is because I think the point is important, and I am glad it has been raised. I suggest the government should give consideration, to it and perhaps something could be worked out this year. We will give the government credit for examining into it.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister) Order No. 8.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT, 1939

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order, third reading of Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Socieities Act, 1939". Mr. Kennedy.

Hon. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): I move third reading of Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act, 1939".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

GAME AND FISHERIES ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order, third reading of Bill No. 84 "An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act, 1946". Mr. Scott (Peterborough)

Hon. HAROLD R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): I move third reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act to amend The Tame and Fisheries Act, 1946".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 48.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 48th Order, second reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): I move second reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949".

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrews): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is in a position to enlighten the House on a matter of great importance affecting superannuated teachers that was discussed last year in this House; it was discussed at great length -- and that is a problem of these superannuated teachers who retired because of age sometime ago, and they entered into the pension scheme in advanced years, and, of course, the pension is low and expenses are still high, and they are almost on a starvation pension.

The matter was discussed last year when the Bill was up, and while the government agreed with the proposition, that the amount was totally inadequate, they promised to give the matter some consideration later.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the problem has not been solved. The cost of living is away up, and the problem of the superannuated school teachers has not been solved.

There are many old school teachers who taught many of us in this House, who are retired now on a pension that does not compare with their needs. Whether this problem should be met by an amendment to the Act, or by an Act of government, or Order-in-Council, I do not know. I do suggest,

however, Mr. Speaker, when we are discussing the Superannuation Act, this matter should receive the attention of the House, and the government should make another attempt to rectify this very unhappy situation, a situation for which no individual is responsible; but it is a responsibility which we must assume in order to do the right thing by the old-timers who gave their life's blood to the profession of school teaching, and now they are on the same level as the Old-Age Pensioners.

MR. S. J. HUNT (Renfrew North): I have a letter here, Mr. Speaker, from one of the retired teachers, and I would like to table it.

Evidently everything is not as bad as the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) would paint it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr.Speaker, if everything is going to be tabled, I would table the brief that was presented last year. Nothing has taken place to change the situation. I am talking of the group of the old-timers. Their pension allowance is totally inadequate.

MR. PORTER: The provisions of that Bill were all discussed one year ago, and it provided for the teachers who would come in, not only last April, but also for retired teachers.

It was provided that all teachers under the old scheme would have a lump sum increased from that time, and the minimum was set at $600. a year, and provided that teachers would get twice as much as under the old scheme.

There was sincere discussion on that action, and the House voted 100 percent. on it, and including the vote of the hon.member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) -- he did not oppose it.

MR. SALSBERG: I certainly spoke on it.

MR. PORTER: Now he suggests that something was done and left unfinished. I have nothing further to add, Mr. Speaker. It was accepted at that time, and it was decided at that time.

If the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) thinks some of the older teachers are starving today, why did he not bring that up a year ago?

MR. SALSBERG: I did. I did very strongly. I voted for the Bill, as the other hon. members of the House did, because it was an improvement on the previous conditions of the retired teachers.

You will recall the presentations made to the government by superannuated teachers, particularly the male teachers, have been that the pension does not provide them with an amount that will meet the minimum of their requirements. I wish to refresh the memory of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that from this desk I suggested to the government to agree to make available to the Fund $1,000,000. out of the Treasury of the Province, so as not to endanger the Fund, but out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, to grant the amounts necessary to meet the requirement of these old-timers.

You do not have to vote against the Bill in its entirety. I do recall, and no doubt hon. members of the government will admit -- the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Morrow), perhaps the most popular member in this House -- he defended the Bill, but he admitted in his speech that there was much to be done, and he said: "Let us take it by stages".

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that no one in this province will question the government if they were to make available the funds they require to give that special group of retired teachers the minimum necessary for living their last years in comfort and in decency.

MR. PORTER: The amount required to take care of the increase for teachers amounted to more than $1,000,000.

MR. SALSBERG: How much would it require?

MR. PORTER: I think it was estimated last year at nearly $2,000,000.

MR. SALSBERG: I think that is $2,000,000. that we could spend very well, and you would receive the blessings of these retired school teachers.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, I will say once more that the teachers who are now retiring are well taken care of, but the teachers who retired previously are not.

These people taught at low salaries all through the depression years, and although their salaries were increased, they got their retirement on a basis of 50 years, and the depression made the amount they received as retired teachers lower than it would have been.

The fact that they got small salaries in their first years meant they could not save. I do not know how they eat with $300. to $700. a year.

I do not wish to embarrass anyone, but I know that a lot of these teachers, retired teachers, are living on a mere pittance, after having given a lifetime of service to their profession.

The teachers not yet superannuated, when they do retire, they will be fairly well looked after, and I am glad of that. I am concerned with the teachers who are now retired on a pittance, after having given most of their years, and their most valuable services to the children of the province.

I do not know whether it is the teachers themselves or the government that should look after this.

There are some pitiful cases, and it is not charity that must be given to these retired teachers; all that we should do is give them some sort of comfort and dignity in their declining years. If it costs $2,000,000., then it costs $2,000,000.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): This raises a difficult question, because we would not only have to go into the matter of retired teachers, but into many other matters concerning retired people. In our dealings with this problem last year, we were anxious to help the retired teachers in every way, and we felt that without harming the actuarial soundness of the Fund, we could give them a "break." What was done is much more than perhaps appears; more than the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) would appear to think.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) mentions that compensations were double.

I ran across some teachers who, due to the fact that they were under the old Act, got pensions of $100. and $150. a year, and up to $600. a year, and there was an increase of $120. across the board for everyone who was receiving assistance under the old Act, with a minimum of $600.

I know that $120. may not sound like much, but actually in the end, it was a considerable contribution to them.

I had an old school principal who came to me, and his position was that after 40 years of service, he was getting about $1,100. a year. $120. is a considerable item of assistance when you take that into consideration. I know you will say it is not adequate, but it is considerable. I think today they are getting something material.

And now, the other side of the picture: due to the rise in the cost of living and the changes of conditions, we have some unfortunate things. Like clergymen; there are thousands of clergymen, who gave great service to the province and they thought they were well taken care of in the ordinary scheme of things, but they are not.

My town is a railroad town. The men in that town thought they were well taken care of, but now they are not. Then the members of the Civil Service, men and women, who thought they had made proper provisions for their dependent wives and husbands, now they find that the provision they made is not adequate.

This is a difficult thing that we have in this country at the present time. That is one of the reasons why we have to consider the means test in old-age pensions.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We have to correct that situation. If we can find some manner, and I hope we will, to abolish the means test, that would do more than anything to level up the problem.

In dealing with our teachers, we have thousands of citizens who gave good service to their country, and now find themselves in a position where they cannot get along,

and they did make a big contribution to the country to enable us to carry on.

I think we all agree that if we could better the situation of the teachers, so much the better, but when you get out of actuarial sums, you get into trouble. It is like the Workmen's Compensation. You get into a realm beyond the capacity of the government to deal with.

The indications are, I think, in the next two years or more, the federal government will set up a committee that will be successful in ironing out the problem of the old-age pension, and I think that is the real answer to that.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): How soon, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will be able to get rid of the means test? How soon will it be before we get the means test lifted from the old-age pensions?

I would like to make this suggestion--I am disturbed that this province is getting too friendly with Ottawa.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Nothing will ever suit you.

MR. ROBINSON: I would like this province to approach the whole problem of the means test, and . . abolish it, and we will have made a move in the right direction.

MR. SPEAKER: We will not now have a discussion of the means test. When the Budget Speech comes up, all right.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I am afraid, "started something." I am not saying the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) has not a point, but we will not have a discussion on that now.

Let us not have a debate on the means test.

MR. ROBINSON: I just wanted to make that suggestion,

Mr. Speaker, -- perhaps it was out of order, but it did have a relationship.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): I would say that teachers generally, in particular those ones who retired some years ago, feel that with the devaluation of the dollar, the superannuation they now receive, dollar for dollar, is worth about 50 cents on the dollar compared with what it was some years ago. The dollar today is worth about 50 cents instead of the dollar that it was worth before.

And that is another problem that I wish to bring to the attention of the House. Years ago when they retired, their dollar was worth 100 cents. Now with what they receive, their dollar is worth only 50 cents in actual purchasing power.

Well, I will not get into the question of who did the devaluing. I could say a lot about that. I would like on behalf of the teachers, to urge the government to make this superannuation pension as generous as possible.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): One thing more on this point, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me we have to recognize the fact that the Dominion has some obligation to the province in a matter of this kind.

The province undertook certain responsibilities in respect to civil servants and other people, and whether it is beyond their power or not, the Dominion government which controls matters of credit, allows the dollar to be devaluated, and that presents the provincial government with a brand new set of problems, and the Dominion has not accepted much responsibility.

This should be clarified. It will not do for the Dominion to exercise its powers and then repudiate its responsibility by presenting us with a new set of problems. I know there is the feeling, and I have felt it, that the federal government is a little light-hearted.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Even the lawyers are starving now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No. They are doing pretty well, as the income tax returns would show.

The point is that the province would do well to discourage the movements that are growing up in some sections. It entails a great deal of negotiations and committees and creates new problems for municipal government and other bodies throughout the country.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I can only say that in principle I agree with my hon. friends opposite. I have been endeavouring to preach that from this side of the House for sometime.

AN hon. MEMBER: I thought you were in favour of taking off controls.

MR. FROST: Read my budget address. In view of the modificiations to this Bill, I do think that, after all, in the matter of a real cure for the citizens, there has been more accomplished in the last year than there has been for a long time previously.

This Legislature took certain action last year, and as a result of it, the old-age pension is $40., and now there is a committee at Ottawa which, I think, has a very reasonable method of attacking that particular problem of the matter of getting rid of the means test, which I think is a necessity in the days in which we live.

As regards the value of our dollar, it is one of the great difficulties we have had in our provincial Assemblies. Respecting a subvention of taxes, one year it is so much and the next year it is less. That is one of the reasons that we stay as close as we do. I can assure my hon. friends that these things will receive the fullest consideration, and we look to the future with optimism.

MR. SPEAKER: There has been lengthy discussion on this Order, and now we seem to be getting on world currency. If it is relevant to the Bill, I do not think the time is lost.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The discussion is entirely in order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It deals with one group.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is a financial problem.

MR. MacLEOD: All I can say is if we have gone astray it was the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) who led us astray.

MR. FROST: I would never lead you astray.

MR. MacLEOD: That is not in character. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) mentioned a committee that was to be set up concerning the old-age pension.

One year ago a committee was set up to revise the Election Act, and nothing seems to have been done.

MR. PORTER: Are you not satisfied with the Act?

MR. MacLEOD: You are the one who set up the committee, but that is getting far afield.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: There is no doubt whatever that the problem that arose in connection with this Bill is a problem that extended into many Bills. This government set up a

commission respecting the Workmen's Compensation. We are not permitted to discuss that, but I think we may say that this question took up several days, and there will be recommendations made to the government on this point as to how the Workmen's Compensation will be computed, taking into consideration the cost of living and so on. If the government is going to be obliged to take certain action to bring the recipients of Workmen's Compensation into line with the cost of living, it is logical that they should be mindful as well of the particular case of the school teachers.

I did gather from what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said, that he is going to the Dominion-Provincial conferences, and that the problems will come up. I hope he will use his powers, which are most persuasive, when with the leaders, to come to grips with this whole problem of social security, so that all the needs of these people in this and other provinces will be met.

(Take C-1 follows)

After all, the hon. members who sit on the Treasury benches are going to have to retire some day -- I hope, and they probably have some idea of what amount of money they would like to have, upon which to retire. They have a good idea of what their needs will be from seventy years on, shall I say? I do not know what figure they have hit upon, but I do not see any reason why we should not feel that the schoolteachers who taught in Ontario many years ago, when salaries were low, can get along on less than you would want to have, Mr. hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) when you retire, a few years hence.

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Why pick me out?

MR. SALSBERG: You are not retiring.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say two words. We here are all very vitally concerned about the retired teachers who could not save out of their very low salaries in years gone by, enough to live on in these days of dollars with reduced purchasing power. We feel there is a moral obligation there, and I compliment the government on their attempt to face up to that to some extent a year ago.

My remarks this afternoon will not go into the financial problems themselves, or the old age pensions, but on this particular matter of superannuation.

I think some of us will live long enough to look at this Bill and the provision for superannuation for teachers in the province of Ontario, and will say the same thing about the people who now appear to be saving adequately.

MR. SALSBERG: Saving, how? I am sorry, I did not hear the hon. member (Mr. Wismer).

MR. WISMER: I will put it this way; we now have a

superannuation scheme based on more adequate salaries for teachers, -- not necessarily satisfactory yet, but more adequate, who are able to save a higher percentage under the scheme, and can get a higher retirement allowance when they do retire.

My warning is this; many of us will live long enough to say later that now it was too low, and we will have the same moral question, and obligation for looking after these people, and the reason for that is printed on your dollar bill. It does not say on the dollar bill any longer that they will pay anything except another dollar bill. In other words, the currency with which we are dealing -- the figures you put in the Act -- and the monies you will put away in savings accounts has changed due to the sort of thing which, while it was all right a few years ago, has now become something man manipulates. The dollar value changes from day to day. If you save a dollar in 1950, by 1970 it may not be worth anything. On the other hand, if you save a dollar in 1950, by 1970 it may be worth twice as much. It is just a matter of man's manipulation; the value no longer rests in a dollar bill.

I rise to make these remarks, because I definitely think the provincial government are ill-advised to get into this kind of scheme any longer, considering the Federal government has all the power to change the value of the currency. If they are going to keep that power -- and I submit they should -- and control the value of the currency, they should take the responsibility for what it may be worth in savings, and the provincial governments should not be looking into schemes of this kind, where the Treasury is involved.

I think every one of those schemes is unsound, however fine or excellent they look at the present time. Each one is just a patchwork, and the result can be raised time and time

again in this House, by saying that the government should pay a little more for these people who get caught in the change of currency over which the provincial government has no control, nor has the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) any control, and even this House has no control. The only hon. minister who has any control is the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) at Ottawa, and it is to his treasury we should go to make up these deficiencies.

I think it is a sort of thing, as we go on and expand, about which we will have to take more cognizance, to keep the province free in that respect, in regard to schemes which perhaps we cannot live up to, in the future.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

(Page C-4 follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 49.

THE ATHLETICS CONTROL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-ninth Order, second reading of Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Athletics Control Act, 1947", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Athletics Control Act, 1947".

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) going to speak on this Bill?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I think I gave a very full explanation on what the Bill was designed to do, on first reading.

MR. MacLEOD: It was very short.

MR. PORTER: I am always concise, not like the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod). I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat what I said before.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, it is several days, and it is awfully hard to retain the concise remarks of the hon. minister (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) is an assiduous reader of Hansard, and I thought he might have read it.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I never even look at it any more.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): It is too heavy to carry around.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, this Bill does not contain anything that I can see which would deal with the question of taxes on so-called "Athletic Contests"

or "Exhibitions" which are classed as amateur, but which really are, in fact, professional.

I think perhaps the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) might have incorporated into this amended Act some way in which the province could reach these people who are exploiting the term "amateur" to their own agrandisement. I think the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) could well add a section to cover that, and permit the monies received to promote a community council, who, in turn, would promote real amateur sport.

I have in mind the football situation and hockey, and even amateur boxing, because I understand that an amateur boxer in Ontario is not recognized as an amateur by the Amateur Union of Canada. And if that is so, I do not think anybody from Ontario was qualified to go to New Zealand for the Empire Games.

If that is the situation, the Treasury Department is entitled to its "cut" of twenty per cent, so we can devote it to amateur sport.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that raises a very interesting question. I must admit that the line between "amateur" and "professional" sport is beyond me, and I imagine it is beyond the hon. members of this House to determine what is "amateur" and what is "professional".

I must say in this Act my recollection is that last year we abolished the twenty per cent tax which applies heretofore, or at least we abolished it in part, although I just forget the actual course we took. The fact is, it is very difficult to say that one sport is a professional sport, and to impose a twenty per cent amusement tax, under the Hospital Tax Act, and then not apply it to something else.

That is a matter which has been giving us concern, and I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Thornberry) that he has raised

a very important point. How to deal with it is a difficult matter. Where does amateur sport end, and professional sport begin, in these days? We find there are many of these little clubs which apparently represent -- although perhaps I am using the wrong expression -- some professional organization. That seems to be the case, if what we read in the newapapers is correct, and if that is the case, are they amateur or professional? I think some day we will have to have a committee to examine into that, and determine it.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Where is the decision made at the present time? In the Department of the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost)?

MR. FROST: Actually, the decision is made in the Treasury Department.

We are, of necessity, relying upon the old practices relating to what is "amateur" and what is "professional".

I must admit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I think our interpretations are completely out of date, and I would go further, and say it is very difficult to see how a big football union or League can operate with men who are avowedly professional in their ranks. There may be some amateurs; no doubt there are, but it seems to me it is straining a point to say these exhibitions are not professional, and should not be taxed.

We took over a tax from the Federal administration in 1947 or 1948, and we took their interpretations, and we have carried their interpretations down since that day, but their interpretations were no doubt based on the fact that they ran into the same difficulty of interpretations as we have, as to what is "amateur" and what is "professional",

The hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) brings up a very important and a very interesting point, and one in which I think the public, one of these days, will feel they should have a say.

But there is going to be a hospital tax levied on professional sport; perhaps we ought to be more broad in our interpretation of what is "professional".

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might clarify it a little further, by referring to the original Act, of which this is an amendment.

The Act defines as follows:

"Professional contest or Exhibition shall mean a professional contest or exhibition of baseball, bicycle-riding, boxing, dancing, golf, hockey, jaialai" --

That is a good old Cuban game. They play it in Cuba, and I believe play it around some of the cigar stores here.

" -- lacrosse, motor-cycle riding, physical prowess, whether by contortion or otherwise" --

That applies to the hon. members of the Opposition, --

" -- rowing, rugby, running, skating, whether speed skating or figure skating --"

MR. JOLLIFFE: That applies to the government.

MR. PORTER: As far as the government is concerned, it is not a professional sport.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: -- "soccer, swimming, tennis or wrestling, and a professional contest or exhibition of any other sport or game designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

MR. MacLEOD: Is politics not included in the games there?

MR. PORTER: Yes, it includes indoor sports, too. Maybe some other indoor sports, not yet designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

In the amendment of 1949, it was provided that:

"Every person conducting a professional boxing or wrestling contest or exhibition shall pay to the Minister an amount not less than one percentum and not exceeding five percentum of the gross receipts in respect of such contest or exhibition as shall be determined by the Minister with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

That clarifies the situation.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Very much so.

MR. HARRY WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I believe you have one amateur class, and that is in the public schools, -- the secondary schools. Other than that, I think the rest of it is professional in varying degrees.

I might say we have two groups of athletes, one trying to get there, and the other group which has arrived there. That is about the size of it. It is only hypocrisy to say they are amateur, in any sense of the word.

When a student in a secondary school can be approached by a professional club, and his name put on a contract, which contract provides that if he plays for money, he plays for that club, then he ceases to be an amateur any longer. That man is contemplating a professional career in sports.

While I do feel in the case of some of these clubs there might be some consideration given to them, because, after all, they are helping to build up the athletes, the fact of the matter is that there are only two of them, the "kids" in the schools, who are amateurs, and all the rest are

professionals; and we might as well face that fact.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), whether this Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Athletic Control Act" deals with the public displays of athletic skill by professional athletes on Sunday, and if not, does he intend to bring in a Bill this Session dealing with that specific question?

MR. PORTER: If the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) would read the Bill, which I do not think he has, there is nothing in it which refers to "Sunday" at all.

As far as introducing any Bill on that subject of sport, that is entirely irrelevant to the discussion on this Bill.

MR. SALSBERG: It might, however, be construed as very relevant to the interested public.

MR. PORTER: Of course, we are not playing to the gallery in this House.

MR. SALSBERG: Only to special groups.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 50.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fiftieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 97, "An Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1947", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 97, "An Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1947".

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, may we have some explanation of the Bill.

MR. WELSH: I gave the explanation which appears in

the footnote, on the original motion.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Is there any reason why it should be passed?

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for administering it, I see no reason for it not being passed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I say that is a highly improper attitude for an hon. minister of the Crown to take. This Legislature is a parliament. On first readings, the hon. ministers usually, as a matter of courtesy, give a brief explanation. On second reading, the hon. minister is expected -- if he is an adult minister -- to give reasons, if he has any, why the Bill should pass the House, and it should not be necessary to call upon an hon. minister to give those reasons on second reading, nor is it proper for him to say, "I explained it the other day; why should it not pass?"

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I will explain it again. There is no deviation from the principle whatever in this Bill. It is clearing up two or three ambiguities which have arisen in the last two or three years. I will be glad to give the explanation again.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Give us some reasons.

MR. WELSH: Under the present Act, in section 1, under the present section, in case of death, twice the amount of the contributions plus interest, is paid to the personal representative. As re-enacted, this double amount will be paid only where a widow or a child or children are left.

Under section 2, widows and children of the class defined in subsection 3 of section 27 are not entitled to an allowance. Any right to a payment is under section 25, that

is, a double refund. But this applies only in the case of the death of an employee, not in the case of the death of a former employee, who is in receipt of an allowance.

As re-enacted, subsection 3 corrects the oversight, and specifically sets out what such widows and children will be entitled to.

The new provision is dated back to March 1, 1948, which was the date the present Act came into force, in order not to disbar any person entitled to the payments intended.

(Take D follows)

With respect to the third section of the Act, the old Bill, section 34, permitted persons who were civil servants on March 1st, 1948, and who were formerly school teachers to transfer their contributions from the Teachers' Superannuation Fund to the Civil Servants' Superannuation Fund if they made the request to do so before the first of July, 1948.

The amendment extends this period to July 1st, 1950, the reason for this being that some of these people affected claimed---and I think rightly---that they were not aware of that deadline and rather than do an inustice to them, we are extending that period until July 1st 1950 and notifying them all in person because we know the ones who are affected.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 51.

PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT, 1950

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 51st order, second reading of Bill number 100, "The Provincial ParksAct, 1950." Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 100, The Provincial ParksAct, 1950.

As I explained on the first reading of the Bill, there is no change in principle in this Act. This Act was originally brought in in 1913 and we felt it should be revised to suit modern conditions.

Ipperwash Provincial P ark has come into being since that time, so we felt it should be mentioned in this Act so it would be named along with the other parks.

Section 10 deals with protective measures which might have to be undertaken by the Department. Should there be such works go on as a hydro line, a highway construction

or a pipe line be laid across one of those parks, it might require additional protection in respect to the game and fish, and we wish to have some means whereby, if this were caused by private contractors, the cost of such extra precautionary measures could be charged against them.

Section 11 designates the parts of parks which might be set aside for resort use and makes provision for regulating the location of sites and limiting the number of commercial resorts. At the time this Act was introduced in 1913, they did not have the problem of commercial resorts that we have today and we feel we must have legislation to keep a close check on this.

Then we bring up to date, to cooperate with the Department of Mines, the regulations regarding mining in the parks, and this section has been worked out in conjunction with the Department of Mines.

In addition, we introduce a section under which, by cooperation with the Federal government, we will be able to have some control over air traffic into the parks. This is becoming rather a serious problem with us and we felt we should have the necessary legislation to be able to control it in some way.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) would explain the difference between the parks designated in this Bill and the Provincial forests which, to some extent, are similar. They also have recreation areas in them. I am referring to, say, an area somewhat the same as Methuen Park in his own riding.

I wonder what the difference is? Does this Bill give a different sort of provision to a park of game enforcement, or provide more overseers, or just what is the difference between the two types of forests?

HON. MR. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) refer to the Crown game preserve in Peterboro?

MR. DENNISON: Well, it may be called a "Crown game preserve," or a "park," I am not just sure.

HON. MR. SCOTT: It is locally referred to as a park, but actually that is just a Crown game preserve.

MR. DENNISON: Then may we have the difference in the administration? Just what do you do in this Bill to the provincial parks that you do not do to a game preserve, when in each case it is all owned by the Crown?

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Methuen is not owned by the Crown.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): A game preserve is generally on privately owned land, is it not?

HON. MR. SCOTT: We have both privately owned and Crown land in the game preserves.

MR. NIXON: What, in Peterboro County?

HON. MR. SCOTT: Yes, in the game preserve.

MR. DENNISON: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I just leave it at this: Probably it is unfair to ask a question of this kind without prior notification to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott); I wonder if he might consider the very good, I think, beneficial results that might occur to the province if we had a uniform enforcement program as is outlined in this Act, uniform regulations applying to not only our parks but our government owned game preserves?

HON. MR. SCOTT: I will be glad to take that into consideration. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I feel in these Crown game preserves, they are put inthere with the idea of harbouring, sheltering game animals, from which they will spread out into the surrounding areas. Frankly, I have in the back of my mind the thought that it might not be a bad idea if occasionally the Crown game preserves were thrown out and an adjoining area set up as a game preserve, to overcome the possibility of predators becoming too firmly established, as might happen in our game preserve

in Peterboro County. The Crown game preserve makes it a little more flexible than designating it as a provincial park inthe Act here.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I do not expect the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) to be specific as to location, but have you other provincial parks in mind for the future?

HON. MR. SCOTT: Not this afternoon, anyway.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 46.

THE MARRIAGE ACT, 1950

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 46th order, second reading of Bill number 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950." Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of Bill number 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950," there are some remarks I would like to make before making this motion, in view of the fact they were not made on the first reading of the Bill.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Not yet.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 87,"The Marriage Act, 1950."

The British North America Act provides that the Dominion Government has exclusive legislative jurisdiction in respect to marriage and divorce, and the Provincial Legislatures have exclusive legislative jurisdiction in respect to the solemnizing of marriage. This constitution has been interpreted to mean that the Dominion may legislate in respect of the capacity of persons to marry, in other words that the Dominion may legislate as to whether first cousins can marry or otherwise.

On the other hand, the provinces, it has beenheld, have jurisdiction as to the formalities of marriage, such as to whether persons may be married by license, or by banns; where they may be married, and whether by a clergyman or otherwise.

With respect to the question of consent of parents to a person under age being married, the issue is long in doubt as to whether it related to capacity to marry and therefore became a Dominion matter, or to formalities of marriage and therefore came within the ambit of the Provincial legislative jurisdiction. Consent of parents, however, has been held by the courts to relate to the formalities of marriage and therefore to be a provincial matter.

The present Marriage Act was enacted a great many years ago and many of its sections are ambiguous and are poorly arranged. The new Marriage Act has been prepared to remove, and we hope and believe it is does remove the ambiguity of many of the sections, particularly the sections inrespect to the registration of persons who may solemnize marriage in the province and in respect to the publication of banns. Also, the new Act has a more workable and orderly arrangement. The sections of the present Act are often lengthy and sometimes difficult for the layman to understand. In the new Act, the sections are broken down and the wording is, I believe, more concise and more intelligible. In the present Act, a good deal is left to inference and the law is sometimes obscure; in the new Act we have tried to state it as definitely as is possible.

In this new Act, the only major change in the laws in respect to the civil marriages and the declaration of the courts of the presumption of the presumption of death in the event of a spouse being missing for seven years. The new Act also contains other substantial changes as follows: Under the present Act, only ministers or clergymen of churches or religious denominations may be registered to solemnize marriages. The words "churches or religious denominations" have been interpreted by the courts to mean churches that are denominational and not undenominational, and also churches that have a number of congregations. This interpretation

has worked a hardship in the case of some undenominational churches which have existed for a number of years and have a large following but whose clergy under the present Act cannot qualify for registration.

The new Act substitutes the words "religious body" for the words "churches or religious denominations" and accordingly will broaden the field for the registration of the clergy. Another change in principle in the new Act permits more freedom in the registration of clergymen who are not resident in the province of Ontario. In many cases it is advisable to grant a temporary license for clergymen to solemnize a marriage in the province. We had one case which happened last Summer, when one of the leading Bishops in Great Britain came over to Canada to officiate at the marriage of his niece, and it was necessary to grant him a temporary license and there was considerable difficulty in doing so.

Another change in the new Act is in relation to banns. The sections in the old Act were rather ambiguous and were capable of several different interpretations. It also permits banns of a person to be called in any church in the municipality where he resides, whether he is known in such church or not. The new Act clarifies the requirements in respect to the publication of banns and provides that banns may only be called in the church where the person attends religious worship---in other words, banns must be called where the person is known.

Sometimes a person under 18 years of age desiring to be married cannot obtain parental consent, such consent being arbitrarily withheld. Or the person desiring to be married has been supporting himself or herself for some time and the parents have no direct interest in the child's welfare whatever. Under the present Act, the responsibility of such cases rests upon the issuer of marriage licenses as to whether or not a license should be issued. This seems an unfair responsibility,

and the new Act provides that the person desiring to be married can make an application to a County Court judge for an order dispensing with parental consent in such circumstances.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the government on this revision of the Marriage Act containing, as it does, provision for civil marriages. I think is a provision that is long overdue in our province and will be welcomed by almost all our churches and by the vast majority of clergymen.. It will now be possible for those who have no particular religious beliefs to be married without going thrugh a ceremony in which they do not believe.

While I am congratulating the government upon its handling of the broad problem, I also regret very muchthat the government has not seen fit to incorporate in this revision my Bill number 52, which is now before the House and which would provide for a compulsory blood test before marriage. Unfortunately, I believe tht if this new Marriage Act passes, my Bill number 52 will be wiped out. It attempted to revise something which will not be in existence, and therefore I would like to speak for just one minute or two on this principle which I think should be adopted by the province and might very well be incorporated in this Act.

The principle of pre-marital blood tests is not new. It has been adopted by four of the provinces of Canada, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and in addition to that by 32 of the States of the United States who have in operation compulsory blood tests for syphillis before marriage.

Well now, the very best argument I have seen in favor of this Act was given by an hon. Conservative member of the Legislature in 1947, the late Dr. Gordon Millen, then member for Riverdale. This, Mr. Speaker, does far better than I could do to present the arguments and the reasons for this particular Bill---Bill number

52, which is going to be wiped out, I believe, but the principle of which, I think, might very well be incorporated in this Act which we now have before us.

Doctor Millen gave a list of the organizations in Toronto and Ontario which supported the principle of a blood test before marriage and there are some 18 of them, including the Catholic Women's League, the General Synod of the Church of England, the Big Brother Movement, the Big Sister Movement, the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire, Kiwanis clubs, the Financial Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, Home and School Clubs and so forth. The leading organizations in Ontario support the principle of a blood test before marriage.

The experience of the four provinces of Canada which have this Act in operation shows that two persons out of every thousand who undergo marriage and undergo this test have proved positive in the examination, which means that if the same percentage applied in Ontario, that annually there are more than 1000 people who are married in Ontario who have this particular disease. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a tragic circumstance, I think it is something that we should try to correct by making it necessary for every person contemplating marriage to have a blood test. It would be a safeguard for future generations as well as a safeguard for the health of those who do undertake marriage.

I am not going to say more. I hope the government will consider accepting an amendment in Committee of the Whole to incorporate this particular feature. I might say it doesnot prevent marriages. Where the tests prove positive, this Bill would not prevent people being married, but it would acquaint them with the situation. Personally, I would like to see it entirely prohibit the marriage until the disease is cleared up, but this Bill makes it compulsory for those who undergo the test in cases where the

test shows the disease to be existing, to acquaint the other party to the marriage. Under those circumstances, I would imagine the marriage would be either postponed or stopped completely.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I had thought the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh), in speaking on this Bill, would have given us more reasons for recommending to the House the civil marriage provision in this Bill. As the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) has said, the Bill constitutes a revision and a consolidation of existing marriage laws with some minor amendments.

There are some 55 sections altogether in the Bill, but unfortunately the most important one is that which makes provision for civil marriage to be placed in The Marriage Act now for the first time, although the Marriage Act has, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) says, been in existence for many, many years and many generations and most of us have got along very well under the provisions of that Act. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether I am becoming a reactionary Conservative in my old age or not, but I must say that I do not favor this new provision for civil marriage and I had hoped the government, if they wanted to bring forward this suggestion, would do so in a separate Bill rather than as one section, number 25, in a long Bill of some 55 sections, with every other section of which I am in accord, and wish to support on second reading.

Some years ago I had the responsibility---in fact for some 13 years--which my hon. friend (Mr. Welsh) now holds, as Provincial Secretary, of the administration of The Marriage Act. I would have thought that he would have brought forward some strong arguments to support this radical suggestion that we should now have a form of civil marriage.

This was not a new suggestion by any means. I know on two

separate occasions, and one in particular, there was a very strong agitation---very vocal, in any case---put forward by certain interests at that time, in 1936, to have this provision for civil marriage placed in the Act. I gave the matter some consideration then and I was very strongly opposed to it and I am equally opposed to it today. I do not know whether or not I am a "lone wolf" in the House in this matter, but in any case I am going to find out if I am.

It always seemed to me that the agitation for a civil marriage came from the ministerial class who were performing marriage ceremonies, rather than from those who wished to be married. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have never in all these years of experience known of a single individual who objected to having a prayer said and a blessing asked over his marriage ceremony and union. There are two times in anybody's life when they do not seem to object to the presence of clergy, and that is when they are married and when they are buried. Certainly not the latter time, anyway, because they are past protesting, probably, but I nevertheless I have not known anyone desiring to be married who objected to being married by those whom this province has set out as qualified persons to conduct a marriage ceremony. Some ministers, of course, I believe are prevented by rules of their church from marrying divorced persons and probably do not wish to recommend to thoe asking for this service to go to some other denomination, but the general objection seems to be based upon personal grounds against marrying individuals who may be divorced or those who have no religious beliefs, those who are atheists, or agnostics. Personally, I have not had much experience in meeting such individuals. I have never felt that anyone is so hopelessly in that class that at least they will not admit that they are living in the year 1950 A. D., which means after the birth of Christ, and starting from

that they can acknowledge many other beliefs as well.

I think we have been getting along very well under the existing legislation, and as for those who are anxious to get married go, I think there is very little demand for this legislation. I hope so, in any case. I know in Saskatchewan last year, there were only 20 in the whole province during the whole year who asked for a civil marriage, andin Manitoba there was less than one and a half per centum. and it seems scarsely necessary to pass such dangerous legislation for such a small percentage of the people. Because it is dangerous; in this province there seems to be more of aninclination to ape what is being done in the States to the south of us and we know there that the form of civil marriage is used very largely and very casually too, Mr. Speaker, and they seem to accept the marriage vows as casual as any other contract which can be easily broken, and is very frequently and easily broken.

As the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) has said, the Parliament of Canada enacts the laws which set out who may marry, and that is no responsibility of ours. Divorcees may marry, atheists may marry, some poor sinners---which includes most of us, all poor sinners---may get married under the law of Canada and it is their responsibility; the responsibility is upon the Parliament of Canada and not upon the minister who performs the ceremony of marriage. Andthis hon. Legislature has the responsibility of saying who may conduct that ceremony and so there again the respnsibility is not the minister's, but is ours, and in conducting the marriage ceremony, the minister is acting in the capacity of a civil servant of the province of Ontario, carrying out the regulation of the laws of this province. I cannot see that the responsibilities should rest so heavily with him, and in any case you know, Mr. Speaker, there is an old proverb that you should "take the bitter with the sweet," and there is so much sweetness in

connection with marrying and giving in marriage that a little bit of the less sweet should make the rest even more palatable.

I do not think that in our hearts we would say the Federal law which sets out those who may marry is in any great extent very far wrong. There are those, unfortunately, whose first venture in matrimony has ended in disaster and "gone upon the rocks", but I will venture to say there are none in this House who do not know, in their own communities -- small rural communities as they may be even in many cases -- many instances which have come to their observation, where in the second attempt there has been a happy, normal life lived after marriage. And then, of course, we have the one outstanding instance -- after all, we have to be realistic in these matters -- where the King of England gave up his Crown for the lady of his choice and was married, Mr. Speaker, by an Anglican minister if I remember rightly, and they have evidently lived happily ever after, in any case we see their pictures in the papers of those who are the best dressed in the world, and that is an indication of something or other, as my hon. friend for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) would say if he were here.

Then, if it is wrong and embarrassing to a minister of the gospel to perform the marriage ceremony in certain circumstances, is it not equally so for the layman of the same church? I am bound to say, in reading the observations of judges and magistrates who are involved in this legislation, that they do not look forward to it with any degree of enthusiasm. Evidently the same arguments that weigh with the minister would weigh equally strong with the layman, and even more so, probably, because, after all, the ministers of the gospel, I presume, are supposed to have a little of the inside track and the edge on us when it comes to arguing us past St. Peter at the pearly gates.

MR. J. W. FOOTE (Durham): Just the same as you.

MR. NIXON: I notice that Judge Barton of York County said:

> "The judges are so rushed with work they would not have time to perform marriages."

Judge Honeywell---and I think this is the Honeywell who was a former Conservative member in this House---said:

> "There won't be any night marriages so far as I am concerned, but performing marriages generally could not be worse than my present landlord and tenant cases."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON:

> "I would not be surprised if they told us to do divorces next, then we would hatch, batch and dispatch."

And Judge Egerton Lovering said:

> "I would not like to be called out in the evening, and I am not particular about marrying people, anyway."

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): It would have to be in office hours.

MR. NIXON: Oh, I know that. Their anxiety is not called for as far as getting out in the middle of the night, as marrying judges do in the States.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Well, the doctor has to go out, why not the judge?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: But certainly, Mr. Speaker, it has been obvious from many comments by magistrates and judges which I have seen that they do not welcome this additional duty. They are not going to get the sweet part of it, theyare just going to get

the bitter dregs that no one else wants, and I do not blame them for objecting.

Now this House cannot say to a judge: "You have got to marry people or else you will lose your job," because judges are appointed from Ottawa. In some cases we do give them some little remuneration for special work, but I have seen some comment in the paper, Mr. Speaker, that any fees which judges and magistrates might receive for performing those civil marriages should be returned to the Treasury.

(Take E follows)

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Would any fees that the judges and magistrates receive for marriages, would they be returned to the Treasury?

Hon. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): There is nothing to prevent giving an additional fee.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, we are reducing this to a casual level. There is something about the marriage ceremony which pretty impressive and sacred. I do not think any of us who have been married will ever forget the ceremony. I know I have not forgotten my marriage ceremony after 37 years. I remember the ceremony very vividly. You know the part of the ceremony where the wife promises to honour and obey. I suggest leaving out the word "obey". It was more than 25 years after the ceremony that I realizedthat mistake. I thought I would look up and see what the government meant about the word "obey" and the other sections of the ceremony, and I might persuade my wife to go to Florida.

This is what I have to say with regard to the ceremony. In the Act each persons says to the other:

> "I call upon these persons here present to witness that I, A.B., do take thee C.D., to be my lawful wedded wife (or husband)."

After which the judge shall say: "I, E.F. judge or magistrate, by virtue of the power vested in me by the Marriage Act, 1950, do hereby pronounce you A.B. and C.D. to be husband and wife."

SOME hon. MEMBER: What page is that?

MR. NIXON: That is on page 87.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I felt that even you with your

extremely impressive Welsh voice, could not make that ceremony, as I have read it,very impressive.

It seems to me to be reduced to the very casual stage, and that is to me,all to the bad. I think this is a retrograde step. It may be that there are some who do not go to church and do not have contacts with ministers, but there is one time in their life when they get married, and then the church has the opportunity to establish contact with these misguided individuals inasfar as previous contact, or lack of it, with the church is concerned.
I think the churches are giving up that opportunity if they are recommending this legislation. It is my experience in the past that these contacts might bear rich fruit if the minister had been able to impress upon the contracting parties the sanctity of the ceremony.

Certainly when this matter was in issue in 1936 I did not find that the ministers who were engaged in the performance of their religious work as ministers were in favour of any such legislation. There were some ministers and associations and organizations that were asking for reform, but I found when the matter was given publicity that I receivedmany letters from ministers throughout the province commending me for opposing the question of civil marriages.

I have not here with me today all the letters that I received on this subject -- my filing system is not as complete as my hon. friend who succeeded me -- but it was my experience that a large number of ministers opposed the setting up of any law for a civil ceremony.

I do not know that I wish to deal with this matter at any greater length; I do think it is a mistake to

break down the sanctify of the marriage ceremony and the general moral fibre of our communities.

Our hon. friend from St. Andrew (Mr.Salsberg) made an observation which registered strongly with me, and I wonder if it did with the others. He said that "we are in the lead, but you are catching up fast."

My hon. friend does not get the significance of that. He said his party was still in the lead, but judging certain actions of this government this year, . . .

he said they were catching up fast, and I am rather sorry to say that in some respects I agree with that, and judging by certain actions of this Legislature under the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) it leaves me to think that we are going hand in hand with the Communists.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): You will not go far astray.

MR. NIXON: I suggest to the hon. Minister he should not push us too far and too fast.

The communistic concentration in Europe, as we can see from our press, is very rough and tough.

MR. MacLEOD: Do not believe everything you read in the newspapers.

MR. NIXON: I can believe some of this anyway. A great friend of mine, Prime Minister Jones of the Province of Prince Edward Island, recently told a delegation of ministers that they should get their heads out of the sand and realize the present conditions. I think that might be applicable here, for those who are pressing for this legislation. I think that the trend is in the wrong direction. So, seriously did I feel on this in 1936 when I was Provincial

Secretary of the government, and there were those in that government who wanted to put this Bill on the books, that I issued a statement denouncing the legislation and undertook that no government of which I was a member would put such a statute on the books.

I know that I am not that strong today, but I do not propose to let the legislation pass without indicating my opposition to such legislation.

I wish to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I trust it will be in order. It is difficult to frame an amendment on second reading that will not interfere with the Bill. There is nothing further from my thought. 54 of the sections out of 55 I approve of. But there is nothing new in the suggestion that on second reading the government could delete a section. The hon. Minister for Labour (Mr. Daley) the other day said he proposed, regarding one Bill, to delete one section and amend another.

The section which I wish to put in I trust will not be out of order. I wish to move, seconded by Mr. McEwing, that the motion be amended after the word "that" --

MR. SPEAKER: I would prefer that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) withhold the presentation of this amendment until after I have given it further consideration.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr.Speaker, in any consideration of this Bill, I wish to assure the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) that he is not a "lone wolf"on the opposition. I agree that there are circumstances where a civil marriage might be necessary, but I deplore the fact that circumstances have forced us to bring forward a Bill such as this at this time.

My feeling is that we are breaking down the home-life of the province.

As you know, a marriage in a church is not only a covenant, it is something very solemn and very impressive, and it is something that those have contracted that marriage in the church will always bear in their memory. A marriage in a magistrate's office or a judge's office is not going to be very impressive, and I feel that more and more people will take advantage of this provision of being married before a magistrate or a judge, and the sanctity of the home will disappear, much to the detriment of our people in the province of Ontario.

I know that many judges do not like the idea of performing a marriage, and I do not blame them.

We have brought up to look upon marriage as something connected with the church. Why now make it a civil ceremony? During my practice as a barrister, I have had many, many people coming to me with their marital problems and I have had success on many occasions in aiding them to solve their difficulties, and go back and resume their married life anew. I have questioned these people as to the circumstances surrounding their difficulties, their marriage and so forth, and I have on several occasions been struck with the answers that they were married in a vestry or in a minister's residence. In very few cases have I found people that were married in a church with the whole ritualistic ceremony of marriage, where their marriage went wrong.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we as members of this Legislature, should think very solemnly before we open the

way to bringing forward civil marriages, and destroying something in our home life, which we may regret in the future.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I have listened very intently to the remarks of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) in connection with the proposition for civil marriages.

I would say at the outset, as far as I am concerned---and I think that that applies to the great majority of the hon. members of the government, perhaps in unanimity----

if they were being married or their children or their relatives were being married, they would feel it was highly desirable that they should be married by a clergyman with all the rites of the church. With that I am in agreement.

I think the weight that the religious aspect ad to the marriage contract is beyond all question. I am in accord with what they say on that. But look at it from the point of the clergyman. After all, the clergyman is the person, according to our law in Ontario, who performs the ceremony. It is in his eyes and should be in the eyes of those who take part in a marriage, that it is a sacred ceremony.

As the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) said, much urging that took place in the past was from the church itself, and I think rightly so.

First of all, we have a number of people in the province who have no religious persuasion whatever. They are agnostics or atheists, and do not believe in the things in which the clergyman. They have no regard for the sacredness of the ceremony. What about the

position of the clergymen there? And as we know, in some churches there are banns which have to be published in connection with marriages. Then there is the problem of divorce. These people with these views have to go all around the country to find someone who has not that particular feeling in connection with divorce.

How about the person who is non-religious or non-Christian, We have the Mohammedans and the Buddhists who come here, who have not the slightest connection with the Christian religion or the Jewish religion. If a Mohammedan wanted someone of his own persuasion to marry him, he would have to get him a license and go 500 to 1,000 miles to have the ceremony performed.

Why should our clergymen not have protection on that? I am totally in agreement with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) as regards the desirability of sanctity of marriage and bringing it into the contract. However, there are cases where this does not apply. Part of the argument of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) -- and it was most convincing to me -- was that he said after all we are making the clergyman a civil servant by carrying out the purposes of this Bill. That seems to me most undesirable. Why take a clergyman who has a strong belief in his principles, and make him a rubber stamp? He has his principles for which he has sacrificed everything, and why should that man have to go through a form and marry unbelievers or Mohammedans or Buddhists or Jews? After all, I think the greatest way you can keep the marriage sacred, and you can keep it sacred, is to keep the circumstances sacred.

After all, if Christians or Jews want to go to their own clergyman, and I hope they will, it is because of their belief in the religious ceremony, and not all the forms and rubber stamps would change that.

I say let us be honest. Let us take the clergyman out of that very unsatisfactory position. They have civil marriages in the United Kingdom and in other provinces of Canada, and I do not think it has let down the bars. I think it is keeping the clergyman and religion on a high plane, which is as it should be. When we have people who are Christians who want to be married by a civil ceremony, and people have no religious belief, they can go to a judge in office hours and they can be married in accordance with the Act.

I think it is altogether desirable. My sympathies are with the church, and the clergyman, when they ask that something be brought in that will relieve them of the civil service. That is a point upon which I want the clergymen relieved, and I would want it removed from that very undesirable state of affairs we have now.

I do not think the number of civil marriages will be very great,--not in this province.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question raised in this House, the question of civil marriage, is a question on which there will be sincere differences of opinion.

I have listened with respect and with sympathy to the hon. members for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), They are older and wiser than I, and I listened to them with respect and sympathy.

It does seem to me, however, that we have here legislation which is owing to the people of Ontario for these reasons.

One of the things about a democracy is it respects the rights and the position of the minority even though it might be a small or insignificant minority. We do not try to put everyone into the same category. We have made in the past, some remarkable provisions. There has been provision made in the Act in days gone by for unusual cases such as the Quakers. This goes a little further than the intention of protecting the minority.

(Take F-1 follows)

and with the intention of respecting their peculiar position.

There is more to it than a matter of right. I agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the number who would take advantage of this legislation would probably be very small indeed, in the province of Ontario. I would be surprised if it was much different than the experience in the province of Manitoba, where there has been only one or two per cent, or perhaps less.

But there is a minority who do not share the beliefs of people connected with any religious denomination, and to be honest about it, should have a civil marriage, and not a religious ceremony.

I think the question of the minorities has been fully discussed, as well as the irreligious minorities.

I want to deal with the position of clergymen for a moment, and I do not pretend that they feel the same way about it, but I wish to say a word or two in their behalf. If it is a member of the clergy who performs the marriage, it essentially is not a civil ceremony. The clergyman is not discharging the functions of a civil servant, or a civil official. It may be that the province has decided, as a matter of record, to accept a certificate of what occurred, and record it, after the event, as a civil ceremony, but as far as a clergyman is concerned, it is a religious ceremony, and a ceremony of deep religious significance, which to some churches is regarded as a sacrament, not as a legal formality, but a sacrament, one of the most sacred concepts of the church. Therefore, I share with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) the feeling as to how painful and embarrassing a matter it is for some clergymen to perform a ceremony, because of the requirements of the law, and to afford a service to the people, to whom the religious

ceremony has no significance whatsoever. I do not think it is fair to ask members of the clergy to perform ceremonies under those circumstances. It is embarrassing for them, because they know that at the moment there is no alternative, there is no option about it; the people who wish to have the ceremony performed have no place else to turn, unless they want to cross the line into New York State or some other place, where the civil marriage can be performed, and many of them may not be able to afford to do that. I do not think it is fair to the parties or the clergymen to insist, as a matter of law, that they have to perform the ceremony for people to whom the ceremony is a sham. Let us be realistic. If they think the ceremony is a sham, it remains a sham, and no amount of religious show, no parade, no churchly elaboration, will make it anything other than a sham, if that is what it actually is for them.

Now, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has emphasized the danger of letting down the bars, or making the act of marriage a casual event, as it is said to be, in some jurisdictions. It would seem to me, if we want to avoid casual, ill-considered marriages, there are other methods which would be more effective. If the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) advocated a longer waiting period, longer than three days, I would not oppose it. I would "go along with him." I would be inclined to favour a longer waiting period. I do not see where anybody is going to be hurt, when making such an important decision, by having to wait longer than three days. If there have been casual, ill-considered marriages, I think many of them have taken place in those jurisdictions where it can be done very, very quickly, and where, as a matter of fact, on a number of occasions, it has actually been done while the parties were under the influence of liquor, before the people were able to sober up.

So, if it is necessary to restrain those who might enter into casual alliances, then I would support measures which would actually bring that about, but I do not see in confining the ceremony to clergymen, that it will achieve that purpose.

I just want to conclude by saying again that this is a matter of principle, on which people invariably differ. We all have our own views about it.

(Page F-4 follows)

For my part, I would not want any of my children to be married with a civil marriage alone. I would feel very badly if they chose to do it that way, but I think we have to respect the rights of the minorities and the rights of the clergy in these matters.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, that it is important to defend in this province the separation of church and State. I do not favor any ancient convention or any step which tends to make the clergy the instrument of the State, or to give them the status of civil servants.

I do not think they want to be civil servants or civil functionaries, or officials of a government or State in this province, and I donot think they should. To the extent that they are required by law today to perform marriage ceremonies as a matter of civil contract, the status they are in at least implies asking them to assume the status of civil servants. I think that is wrong in principle, and I think they shouldbe relieved of that obligation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move the adj urnment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 36.

THE ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honorable the Lieutenant-Governor at the Opening of the Session.

MR. HARRY WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, again, as last year, I find myself addressing you in the chair. If you remember, I came on very late in the budget debate last year, I think about 11 o'clock, and you were in the chair at that time.

So again I am unable to pay my respects to Mr. Speaker in person.

I would like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Reynolds) and the seconder (Mr. Leger) of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, upon the clear manner in which they presented their addresses. Much of what they said I agree with but there was a great deal with which I disagree.

May I also congratulate the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) on the elevation to the high office he now holds. Much as I differ with him in his political and economic philosophy, nevertheless a large group of my fellow citizens have seen in him the pre-requisites of the leader they desire, and have put him in that position, so I congratulate him.

Before getting into the main item on which I wish to speak today, there are a few odds and ends I would like to mention.

I suggested to the government the other day a Commissioner of Racing. Let me assure the House there was nothing personal about that suggestion, and I make that statement in view of what has appeared in the newspapers since the suggestion was made. I do not know any of the men engaged in racing, but I did have my eye on a figure in the public accounts, which states that this government received from racing in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1949, over $3,340,000.

Now, in the parlance of the race track, "That is not hay," and to me it was an important figure, and for that reason, and because there was such disharmony amongst those connected with racing, I raised the point here in the House and made my suggestion.

May I say that to some extent I am going to follow the pattern set by some of the previous speakers, but there are some subjects which I feel there are others in this group better able to speak upon than I. For instance, in regard

to education; I feel we have two members in this group who are more able to carry on a discussion on education, so I will pass that over.

So far as foreign affairs are concerned, other than I realize that foreign affairs do have some effect on this province, there is rather a divided opinion on that subject. I feel that we here in the province of Ontario have a job to do onour own doorsteps; we have a house cleaning to do here; we have a lot of rubbish to clear up in our own back yards before we have any right to stick our heads over our neighbors' fences and make any comments.

(Page F-7 follows)

However, we should be prepared at all times, if, in the conduct of world affairs, anyone should come over onto our doorstep, to take effective action in that connection.

My own riding is an urban riding, here in the city of Toronto. I imagine it has all the problems that other ridings may have, and it may have some problems the same as in some of the rural ridings. It is a long, narrow riding, across the city of Toronto. In the north end there are very beautiful homes, and very good transportation. You can get on a bus at the northerly portion of the riding, and ride to the southernmost portion of it. As you take that bus ride, I have often thought that a good title for that bus ride, if the T.T.C. wished to use it, would be "From Paradise to Hades by Bus", because as you progress southerly, the conditions become slightly gloomy.

When you get to Queen Street, there is facing you that very ignoble structure called "999", a structure which should have been removed many years ago, and may I say to this government, since it is in my riding and affects the people of my riding, that the government give consideration to a very rapid removal of it.

I would also suggest to them that when they plan to remove the patients from that institution to other institutions, that they build two institutions, not one, to house those patients. It is my opinion that all the people who are confined in that institution are not mental cases; some of them are physical cases. The place is overcrowded, and since the showing of a very gloomy picture, it has come to be commonly called in my riding "The Snake Pit". I think that, in itself, should be enough to influence the government to remove that eyesore.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: Both for the sake of the patients, and for the people who live around there, and for the good of the community, it should be torn down.

As you go a little further south, you come to the Massey Harris plant, upon which I will make no comment, except to say that it is a huge manufacturing plant, and employs a great many people.

Further south still, you come to the Exhibition Grounds. They are rather beautiful, and it is a source of pride to this community, that here every year is housed the world's greatest annual fair.

But, unfortunately, there is always a fly in the ointment. Also in the Exhibition Grounds is a place called Stanley Barracks. Now, Stanley Barracks, brings me to the particular item which I wish to discuss today.

In Stanley Barracks there are housed one hundred and fifty and some odd families. They have received notice from the municipal government of Toronto to vacate -- a peremptory notice, just to get out, as of June 1st. What possible family life can you expect under the conditions as they prevail down there?

I will not go into any recriminations concerning Stanley Barracks.

I have said my little piece on the platform publicly in Toronto, They say that "charity covers a multitude of sins", and on my own account, from ulterior motives alone, I need rather a large cloak, so I practise charity.

But, nevertheless, the housing situation being what it is, such a peremptory notice to vacate, from the city of Toronto, has created a terrific problem. This leads me to the conclusion that there is one thing the government can do to

relieve the housing situation, for the low income groups, and that is what the occupants of Stanley Barracks are -- to encourage as much as possible a slum-clearing program. We have one in Regent Park in Toronto. However, I feel that when Regent Park project was started, plans should have been drawn then to start many more, not only in the city of Toronto, where I live, but in other cities in Ontario, so that these slum-clearing projects could have been proceeded with. In fact, I think there is one right in the capital of this country, in Ottawa, from what I saw of it last fall when I was there.

However, I feel that slum clearance is an important item in speaking of housing, because of the many things it can help to do, and the many situations it can help to cure. For instance, it will help unemployment; it will help in cutting down the cost of health services and welfare, yes, and police and fire protection; it raises the assessment values and the building values in the city. In other words, it is an aid to municipalities to finance better, and it also is a part of the governmental step toward raising the standards of our citizens, improving their health, and I think it also raises the moral standard, which all goes together to make for good citizens.

We have another problem in the cities which has developed, and which we know as "juvenile delinquency". It is becoming quite a nuisance, and it is becoming a very expensive nuisance. Many of our municipalities have dipped down deep to try and do something to combat this thing.

Let us see how that is connected up with housing. I have here a statement from a man -- I do not know to what political party he belongs, but I rather fancy he is a very well-respected gentleman in his community. He is a judge of the Juvenile Court, Judge Fraser of the Juvenile Court in Ottawa,

and here is what he has to say about juvenile delinquency:

"....broken homes and juvenile delinquency will continue to mount unless immediate steps are taken to solve wage-earners' desperate housing problem....

....the housing shortage is the greatest single factor contributing to shattered homes and families....

....none of the present housing schemes can deal with the problem of the man earning from $25. to $30. a week."

He said that he personally knew of housing conditions in Ottawa that were not fit for animals.

"There are families of nine and ten trying to live in two rooms with the father and mother sleeping on the floor..."

He suggested that Canada follow the example of countries like Norway and Sweden where large apartment blocks for workers had been constructed and rents were reduced as the size of the family increased.

(Take G follows)

But I say here you do not have to go to Norway and Sweden, we have slum clearance projects right here in America, and I think that it can be truthfully said that slum clearance is good business. They think so in New York. They have undertaken large slum clearance projects in New York, economic and subsidized rental projects, nothing for sale, allfor rent. They expect that by 1956 or even sooner, 500,000 people will be housed in public houses or eight per centum. of the population. And they have been assisted by the Federal and State and municipal funds, but it is under a housing administration set-up of the City of New York.

Here is a comparison of costs to bear out what I stated, that it is good business. This has been prepared from Health and Welfare, which is published by the Canadian Government at Ottawa. It is comparing Regent Park here in Toronto and North Toronto, which is a well-housed area. It says:

	Regent Park	North Toronto
"Fire Protection	$35,000	$9,000"

Those are just rough figures, I can give you the exact ones--

"Social Services	$46,000 as against	$2,500
Street Cleaning Services	$ 5,100 as against	$4,900
"Building Services	$ 801 as against	$ 116
"Health Services	$ 7,200 as against	$3,000
"Total	$95,096 for Regent Park as against	$20,047 for North Toronto

"Taxation Received;

"In the case of Regent Park $31,965; as against North Toronto $83,153."

representing a difference of $63,000 in taxation alone.

Nevertheless, when you want information you want to go to something that is factual and not circumstantial. Regent Park is not finished yet. I may say on that score that the progress there is not just as rapid as it should be, because the project I am going to speak about now was completed in two years from the time plans were drawn.

The Carver Housing roject in Cleveland was the first of its kind attempted in America. It has been occupied and operating for over five years. The facts are in this book--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WALTERS: Do not be afraid, I am not going to read the book, or anything like that, but I am going to quote the odd portion of this book in proof of what I am contending.

This was a thesis drawn up by a gentleman named Warren P. Phelan, assisted by a professor, R. Clyde White. These two men went in to investigate conditions in the slum clearance project, Carver Park, Cleveland, which was in existence five years, as against the conditions they found in the slums that surrounded Carver Park, so that what they have here is factual, there is nothing circumstantial about it.

They called this "Does Good Housing Pay?", and they quote some figures. Of their experience in this investigation, Professor White said:

> "It demonstrates that the values of good housing can be stated in objective terms and that facts which appeal to all reasonable men can be collected for the analysis of these values. This helps to take public

"housing out of the real of controvery insofar as purely selfish interests are concerned..... 'Does good housing pay?'; insofar as the slums of Cleveland are concerned, Mr. Phelan's answer is an unqualified yes."

I quote this chapter from his thesis:

"Poorly-housed people can be found in every section of the country. They are not confined to the slum areas of the great cities. A large percentage of the poor housing is located in the smaller cities and towns, and much of the housing in which rural people lives does not meet accepted standards of health and decency. But it is in a city slum area that the effects of good housing can be most readily measured. Housing in certain slum areas is without exception sub-standard. Ih such areas where bad housing is the predominate characteristic it is possible to take an accurate measure of some of the conditions that prevail. But a survey or a listing of all the conditions which pertain may be without significance. It could be alleged that the deplorable conditions that are uncovered are a result of any or all of the factors characterizing that area, or that they are caused by the particular type of people who live there."

Here are housing conditions inthe small area adjoining Carver Park, some facts and figures: It says 38 per centum. needed major repairs; 83 per centum. were over 45 years old ---that may not apply to some of our cities over here, although I guess it does apply to a large measure to some housing in Toronto. The city is old enough to have houses over 45 years

old, as a matter of fact many of them may be over 100. 28 per centum. had holes in walls; 42 per centum. had no hot water; 83 per centum. had leaky roofs; 65 per centum. families were sharing bath or other facilities; 97 per centum. were without central heat. That was the condition they found prevailing in the slum areas in Cleveland, and which they did something about.

When they had finished their investigation, to bring this to a close, and had studied the Carver Park Project as compared with the surrounding slum areas, they found that in Carver Park, the clear and rebuilt area, the taxpayers in Cleveland were saving every year $61,250 --- $25,000 less for relief rent, $11,000 less for fire protection, $25,250 less for tuberculosis care and hospitalization. In other words the slum clearance makes its way into all departments of government. When the municipal government comesto the provincial government, the provincial government goes to the Federal government with allthese welfare problems, slum clearance has a direct bearing, as they found in Cleveland. It reduces all their costs.

I have not a great deal of time to go into this more in detail, but I have come to the conclusion that one thing the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) in this province should do is investigate thoroughly slum clearance as a project in which this government could take a lead in interesting municipal government. In many cases many of the municipal governments would be very interested, because it is certainly going to improve their position. So in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, I say that slum clearance and good housing generally pays off and, while apparently it is a long range view, nevertheless governments should take a long range view and, if they see this thing is practical, then they should do something in investigating the possibilities. It is not enough for us to have Regant

Park here in Toronto, that is a start, but we should be planning ahead and, on the evidence and on the experience of the people in the United States on slum clearance, I say certainly it is practical, it is the logical step, and this government should consider it very thoroughly and would be doing a service to the citizens of this province.

To close, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that I have tried to be practical in bringing this to the attention of the government. You know, I have heard it said that the role of a member of the opposition in this Legislature is very frustrated. Now, I do not feel like that. By nature and by physique I am not a pessimistic sort of person, I rather look for the bright side in life. However, I do not think it has become apparent enough in this House, that is maybe to a casual person, but there is existing between this group here and the party which forms the government, a very, very wide gulf in planning and economic thinking. We over here are democratic in thought, and in 40 years of study of conditions in my country, I have never seen anything that has influenced me to change my thinking.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: I do not think women alone have the right to change their minds, I think men have the right to change their minds when they have find they are in a very insecure position.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): We have no vacant seat for you yet.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WALTERS: No, there is not any vacant seat for me over there. That is a fact. But we are sitting right here on a very solid basis, but we do see signs in this House and all through governments all over the world that the others are edging slowly towards us, to close the gap.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: We are not edging towards them, they are edging towards us.

MR. DUNBAR: I do not know where it is.

MR. WALTERS: You do not?

MR. DUNBAR: Not in this country. And not in England.

MR. WALTERS: However, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) made a remark the other day that there was only one pot of gold. I agree with him. After all, in this group here there are many varied talents and I do not think that anyone should presume to read us a lesson on political philosophy or economic philosophy. When the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) made the statement there was only one pot of gold, it was an accepted statement as far as we were concerned. I think maybe, though, we have little different ideas as to who fills that pot, and we have different ideas of who should be chipping into that pot.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear .

MR. WALTERS: And we have definite ideas that we do not not like people who, like a certain animal we know, get into the trough with both feet and lay in it. And I think that isthe difference between Socialism and every other "ism." We try to level off, as it were.

When an hon. Minister, or, say, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) makes a statement to this House, I take that as being sororical, and that is a declaration of policy. I have been rather disturbed by by some of the remarks that have been made in this House with respect to the people to whom I have to go back, whom I represent. You must understand, Mr. Speaker, that when I was born into this world it did not take me very many years before I found there was a struggle going on, and if, in the course of events, I have to stand up and fight for that class and society into which I was born, who is there to rebuke me for it?

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Pryde) and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) whose statements to this House showed that there is a tendency upon part of this government to become very impersonal in its relations with the people of this province,---there are many words in the English language, a very descriptive language, which could be used to describe such a government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear .

(Page G-8 follows)

MR. WLATER: Oh, nice words. You can say it is a safe, sane, sound, efficient, business-like administration, and I have heard those "ephitets" used many times, but there is one word in the English language I would much sooner hear describing a government in the province which subscribes to the principl.s of government by the people, of the people, and for the people, and that word is "compassionate."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: And so far I have heard very little from my hon. friends on the opposite side of this House which would lead me to say that this government is compassionate. The hon. Premier's (Mr. Frost) statement respectign the Speech from the Throne to the many thousands of my fellow citizens in this province who are unemployed, who are badly housed, was a very scanty plate to set before them, a plate at the best of "cauld kale" and "burnt bannocks." The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) in his speech, told about the wonderful things this government has done, and, faith, I will give them credit when they do it. You know, there is a statement made by a man in another field of endeavour, but I think maybe I can transpose it into government. It was a man by the name of Newman, who was considered one of the greatest critics of music in the world.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WALTERS: I did notknow my hon. friend (Mr. Newman) was a critic of music. This man was considered the greatest critic of his day. He once said that any music that is worth playing is worth playing badly. My hon. colleague, the member for York East (Miss Macphail) stated here the other day it was pitiful to see Conservatives trying to carry out a socialist program. However, along the same lines as Mr. Newman, I

say that no matter what this government tries to do, that if it is socialist ideas, it is far better they do it badly than not do it at all. At least it is a start in the right direction.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) in his speech told about the building of hospitals, mental institutions, and a bit of the road program, all very necessary things. However, I wonder if there had been a different attitude of government upon the affairs of this province, we would have needed so many hospitals and so many mental institutions. In other words, there is too much "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof". When it is upon us, we take action. No foresight, no planning, no preparation. We do something when it happens -- or we do not do something when it happens, we just let it go. If we took preventive measures, we would not have to be spending so much money on curative measures, and I think that is a logical position to take.

(Page G-10 follows)

Speaking of "businesslike", so far as the efficiency part of the administration is concerned, the position that I take is this, that it is reasonably efficient, but I attribute that probably more to the fact that behind this government is a very efficient civil service, a civil service which to my mind is under-manned and over-worked, and, consistent with the "good business" practices of this government, probably underpaid as well. Because, being businesslike in government is being impersonal. A man who worked his way up to become vice-president of the General Electric Company retired, said he could not stand it up there, the whole life had become depersonalized for him, so he retired out of business for that reason. That man was a successful businessman.

When this government, being businesslike, has a very buoyant economy, everything goes along very nicely, but what happens when something happens to that buoyant economy? In 1948, when this government was preparing to go to the people, it came out with the most beautiful budget and a beautiful surplus, but between the time the election was held and this House sat in 1949, things have changed. That buoyant economy was no longer buoyant.

And these businesslike methods of the government can be very embarrassing at times. So how can we come into this House with a surplus? We had the little spectacle of the hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) of t is province and the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) playing a little game of "button, button, who's got the surplus?" here in the 1949 Session. And I disagree with my hon. friend, the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). I do disagree

with him when he stated the other day he was looking for this government to report a big surplus. This government is not coming in with a huge surplus, in my estimation, this government is probably coming in with a slight deficit. This businesslike way of running a government is very embarrassing.

MR. MacLEOD: You are wrong there. You will find out on Friday.

MR. WALTERS: Well, time will tell. I am going to close on this note -- it is six o'clock, and I am going to close by saying, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) stated the Treasury bench was "Mediocrity Row". I disagree with him most heartily. I am not going to be that lenient with the Treasury bench. There was nothing mediocre about the Treasury bench to me, I think they have got plenty of ability. There may be a little of cross-purposes on the Treasury bench --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: And there may be a little bit of confusion -- a great deal of confusion, in fact, on the Treasury bench.

MR. MacLEOD: And a lot of flexibility.

(Page G-12 follows)

MR. WALTERS: But I am not going to be so lenient as to let them "get away" with that one, that there is mediocrity on the Treasury bench. Oh, no, I say when that Treasury bench comes in here and states a thing to the House, it is done after very careful consideration, and I am going to hold them responsible for ever thing they do. There are no extenuating circumstances so far as I am concerned with the actions of the Treasury bench.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. M. PHILLIPS (Grey, North): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: May I announce to hon. members that Sir Howard d'Egville, Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, will be very glad to meet as many as possible in the Speaker's apartment, and we will be very glad to have you come up.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that when this House adjourns, the present sitting thereof, it do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of rule number 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, can the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Doucett) say whether it is proposed to go on with the Throne Debate tomorrow?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, it is desirous that we go on with that tomorrow afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I suppose there will be some Bills first, will there?

MR. BOUCETT: Well, nothing more than introductions. There might be introduction of a few Bills, but that will be all. We will get on to the Throne Debate from there.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.04 o'clock p. m.

- - - -

Volume 19.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLES THIS FOURTEENTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday,,March 14, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. BRYAN L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Cathcart, from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presented the Committee's Third Report, which was read as follows, and adopted:-

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 17 - An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Bill No. 20 - An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa.

Bill No. 22 - An Act respecting Knox College Library and Certain Archives.

Bill No. 26 - An Act respecting the Town of Riverside.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 20, An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa; and Bill No. 22, An Act respecting Knox College Library and Certain Archi es.

Your Committee would recommend that Bill No. 15, An Act respecting the City of Welland, be not reported.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Newman, that leave be given to intro-

duce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled,"An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) explain the Bill please.

MR. DOUCETT: There are some amendments not of a very contentious nature. There is a provision dealing with traffic at intersections controlled by signal lights, under the new system of lighting, with arrows pointing, either at corners or in between intersections.

The period of suspension of drivers' licenses and motor vehicle permits is doubled, in each case where any person is injured or property damaged. In other words, at the present time the provision provides that a person driving a car while under the influence of liquor, will have his license cancelled for three months for the first offence, six months for the second offence, and one year for the third offence. These have been just doubled, by this Act, six months for the first, one year for the second offence, and two years for the third offence.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOUCETT (There is a provision also dealing with the impounding of vehicles upon the suspension of a license, pending a conviction.

There are a couple of amendments to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, of a very minor nature.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 25 and 55.

Mr. Speaker: I might give to the House an outline of what we would like to accomplish in the next two or three days.

If at all possible, I would like to wind up the addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne on Thursday, in order that the Budget can be introduced on Friday. I realize that Friday is the seventeenth of March, a good day for the Irishmen, but it is also approaching the end of the month, and if at all possible, I think it is desirable that the principal amounts of supply should be taken care of by the end of the month.

It is, of course, not entirely necessary, but it is desirable, if it can be done.

To accomplish this by Friday, if it meets with the approval of the hon. members of the House, we could meet at two o'clock tomorrow and on Thursday. I do that, Mr. Speaker, with the intention of avoiding night Sessions if possible. The situation here in the Legislature is quite different from the situation at Ottawa. It is in no way comparable. There is not the accommodation for our hon. members in this building. I agree with the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) that the accommodations for hon. members here in the Parliament Building are far from satisfactory, and the matter of having night sessions is difficult. The press has to stay here until all sorts of hours, and the hon. members, of necessity, have to be in the House and available.

In Ottawa, the situation is very different. There, they may have much longer sittings, that is, sittings for a much longer period of time, but it is not as necessary that

the hon. members should spend all of the time in the House, as is the case in the Legislature here.

I think last year our experiment of meeting at two o'clock and trying to avoid night sessions was altogether desirable. It may be that we will require a few night sittings toward the end of the Session, but if we can avoid them, we would like to do it. An hour a day each week, not including Friday, is equal to a four-hour night Session, which is a fairly healthy Session, and I think we should perhaps be able to avoid night sittings.

I say this, because the motion which will be presented tonight for the adjournment of the House at the conclusion of this sitting will call for meeting tomorrow and Thursday afternoon at two o'clock, so we can go ahead on that basis with our program.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to spend perhaps an hour on government orders, to clear up the order Paper, and keep it within bounds. There are certain matters which are more or less routine, which might be dealt with in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to inform the House of an anniversary. I do not usually take notice of anniversaries, but there is one today which has come to my mind as well as the minds of all hon. members in the official Opposition, with great impact, I think it must be recognized that this is an unusual day, because, for the first time in this Session at least, the rays of natural sunlight are entering this House to the south, to mark, I presume, the fifty-fourth anniversary of the Whip of this group, (Mr. Taylor).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) has today attained the age of fifty-four years, and anything I have to say for a moment today, I wish to be marked and noted with special care by the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch) the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) and I think also the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). However, I do not wish to inspire in their breasts any feeling of professional jealousy.

I speak for all hon. members of this group when I say we hold in the highest esteem the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) who has served with such distinction as our Whip, since the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-five.

He has not only been the Whip of this group, and an hon. member of this House, but he also has been mayor of the well-known town of Cobalt. I understand that the mayor of Toronto has recently acquired an insignia of his office as mayor. I think this matter of insignias should not be taken too far, and it certainly should not be interpreted too literally, but we do feel that our Whip, after his long years of service, is entitled to some recognition, outside of the recriminations that I usually heaped upon Whips.

We wish to present him today with one or two insignia of his office, with the request that he use them, not only on ourselves, but to ride herd on the intractable hon. members of other groups who are obviously beyond the control of their own Whips.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh,

MR. JOLLIFFE: As insignia number one, we are presenting today to our Whip this piece of chain, and with the best wishes of all hon. members of this group, and since, as I suggested, it may be necessary for him to ride herd on the hon. members

of other groups, we are also presenting him with insignia number two, a pair of silver-plated spurs, one for the Liberal hon. members, and the other for the Conservative hon. members. And as insignia number three, we wish to present him with some neckwear, which is of a nature which perhaps had better not be exhibited in this Chamber, and also including spurs and other proper implements of his high office.

We wish the hon. member for Timiskaming, (Mr. Taylor) very many happy returns of the day, and express our sympathy to his professional competitors in this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this group, it is a pleasure for us to extend, at one and the same time, our congratulations and our sympathies to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) one of the elder hon. members of the House, who has retained his youthful appearance to a very marked degree.

I was very interested in the symbols of authority which have passed from the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to the Whip (Mr. Taylor). The first one looked very much like a skipping rope, and now, at fifty-four, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) just should not be doing that. I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knows what he is doing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: Then, the other thing; in regard to the colour. I hope that has not any particular significance, because it is a very deep red, and we have been taught to object to that colour.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): You are standing on a red carpet.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is the colour of that tie you have on?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: As for the spurs; I think the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) will need those. He can put them to good use in his daily occupation.

Those of us who have watched his actions over the years have grown to appreciate his patience on the one hand, and his mild aggressiveness on the other.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: He has much to contend with, and he contends with it in a very nice way. So we do offer to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) our best wishes and our congratulations on his fifty-fourth birthday.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take B follows)

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, before the final benediction is pronounced, by the Prime Minister, I will say a word.

We join with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the sub-Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) in tendering our warm congratulations to the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) on attaining his fifty-fourth birthday. Both my colleague (Mr. Salsberg) and I have sat with him for seven consecutive years, and there has been no break in our membership in the House, and we have learned to respect and admire the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) very much indeed.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) referred to the fact that the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) had been mayor of Cobalt.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Timiskaming): Not any more.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: I was reading about Cobalt the other night and I noticed during the big silver push someone made off with almost $300, billion. Not much of that remained in Cobalt. Had the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) been near Cobalt during the time of that thievery, he would have taken some action. The last time I was up there, the town seemed to be down at the heels.

It is a great distinction to have been mayor of a town which, at one time, was presided over by a Cape Bretoner, by the name of Jack Munro. We remember the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) and the Opposition, during the absence of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer), and we remember his speeches for Riverdale very well. We remember it was the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) who provoked the great general election of 1945. I can remember they were busy there one afternoon, trying to find a reason to bring on the election, and

I can see the present Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the former Prime Minister (Mr. Drew), and they said, "We have it". The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) had, at one time during the Session, challenged the government to go to the country, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Drew) said"In view of the remarks of the hon. member I will meet the House and advise the Lieutenant Governor to dissolve",and we are all aware of what happened.

We are very happy indeed to join in this expression of congratulation to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) and hope he will continue in the House for many years to come, and get his hon. members well whipped, and use his spurs to spur the government into doing something good for the people of this province.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): We would like to add our words of congratulation to those already spoken on the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) attaining his fifty-fourth birthday. I never thought that the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) could have attained such a great age as fifty-four. I thought he would be about thirty-four, or not even forty-four. He has such a youthful appearance that I did not think that he had attained the great age of some of us here. He has not the gray hairs that go with an age of that sort, he hasa youthful appearance, and that youthful appearance is probably acoounted for by the years in Cobalt.

Perhaps the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) might treat us later, out in the corridor, at the adjournment of the House, with a rendition of a Cobalt song.

However, I want to add our words of congratulation on his birthday. The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor)

has been for a number of years an hon. member of this House, he has a very fine personality, and we all like him very much. We would like to convert him to better ways, perhaps we may. We might change his views into sounder tracks.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Are you looking for a new Whip?

MR. FROST: The hon. member's political views did not interfere with our personal relations. We wish him well, and I hope his health, not political, will continue. We hope his health will be good for many years to come, and that he will retain the youthfulness he now has.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I had no inkling that this would happen. I much appreciate the remarks of the hon. leaders of the various groups, and the flowery comments, particularly those of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) when he referred to my appearance. I might say that the greatest contribution to the lack of gray hair in my head, is a clear conscience.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TAYLOR: And when my hon. friend for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) refers to the"great steal"at Cobalt, it was not all stolen. If you will look at the showcases in this building you will find the gold. I have been trying, unsuccessfully, to get some of that back, through the hon. minister (Mr. Gemmell). It may be that with the spurs and whip, I will be able to persuade him to give us back some of that revenue.

I thank you very.much.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker I now move that this House resolve itself into a Committee

of the Whole, for the purpose of considering the following resolution.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee: Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Frost presents the following Resolution:

Resolved that:

(a) the salary of the auditor may be charged to and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(b) if, when the Legislature is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for repair or renewal thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by the Legislature is urgently required for the public good, then upon the report of the Treasurer that there is no legislative provision, and of the minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent and for the public good, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Lieutenant-Governor for the issue of the amount estimated to be required which shall be placed by the Treasurer to a special account, against which cheques may issue as may be required; and

(c) the Treasurer of Ontario may pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund such sum of money as is required by the certificate or order of the Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General on account of the investigation, detection or punishment of any offence against the laws of Ontario or of Canada, or on account of special services or disbursements in connection with inquests, or any purpose connected with the administration of justice in either civil or criminal matters; and

(d) whenever the Assembly has concurred in the report of the Committee of Supply recommending the passing of any estimates, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may authorize the payment of any items of expenditure so concurred in; and

(e) where an appropriation is exhausted or is insufficiently provided for and the public interest or the urgent requirements of the public service necessitate further payments, then upon the report to the Treasury Board of the minister having charge of the appropriation as to the necessity for further payments and the reasons why the appropriation is insufficient and the amount estimated to be required, the Board may make an order for the issue of such amount as it deems proper which amount shall be placed to the credit of the appropriation against which cheques may issue as may be required; and

(f) the Treasurer of Ontario may pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund accounts for legislative and departmental printing, paper and stationery and other supplies delivered to the King's Printer,

as provided by Bill No. 90, "The Audit Act, 1950."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Is this resolution in the usual form?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): There is no new feature. In reading the resolution which is required under The Audit Act, I am impressed with the extent to which The Audit Act goes. I did not appreciate it altogether. The Act was introduced, I think, forty-two years ago in 1908, and since that time apparently has not been revised. The auditor is an officer of the Assembly; not an employee of the government, as such, but is the servant of the Assembly. He has certain powers, very broad, and very important statutory powers, and the purpose of this resolution is because the Act

empowers the expenditures of public monies and therefore, this resolution is required.

I was impressed, Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman was reading the resolution, with the extent of the powers of the auditor.

Resolution agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 42.

CANADA CONFERENCE EVANGELICAL CHURCH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-second Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting Canada Conference Evangelical Church", Mr. Houck.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 4 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 43.

THE HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-third Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children", Mr. Rea.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 11 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 44

TOWNSHIP OF CORNWALL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-fourth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Township of Cornwall", Mr. McDonald.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 18 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 45.

THE CITY OF GUELPH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-fifth Order; House in Commi-

ttee on Bill No. 19, "An Act respecting the City of Guelph", Mr. Edwards.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 19 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 46.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PROVINCIAL YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-sixth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec", Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 31 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE LABOUR ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 91, "An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act", Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 91 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 92 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6

THE BUSINESS RECORDS PRODUCTION ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 95, "An Act to repeal the Business Records Production Act, 1947", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 95 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

EXTRA PROVINCIAL CORPORATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend the Extra Provincial Corporations Act", Mr. Welsh.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 96 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

THE COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 98, "An Act to amend the Companies Act", Mr. Welsh.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 98 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 99, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act", Mr. Scott, (Peterborough).

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) if the reason for this Act is to make it easier for locatees to obtain their patents. This amendment does away with some of the restrictions, I believe.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Yes. It eases the position.

Section 1 agreed to.

Bill No. 99 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

THE TEACHERS SUPERANNUATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend the Teachers Superannuation Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 13 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 93 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE ATHLETICS CONTROL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Athletics Control Act,,1947" Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 94 reported.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) in regard to boxing there have been a great number of fatalities in the United States, twenty-odd, over a short period of time. Does the Commission take any steps to protect boxers? I know that the crowd is always yelling for blood, and if the referee steps in to stop the fight, he is booed.

We have referees in the Commission who enforce the rules, but I wonder if the Commission has taken any steps toward providing an examination for boxers, by a doctor, before they are allowed into the ring?

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): The Act, as I recall it, does not provide for physical examinations of the kind the hon. member (Mr. Houck) mentions, but I shall enquire if that protection is dealt with, in any case. I cannot answer

it offhand.

MR. HOUCK: I think it is necessary for the protection of the young fellow who enters the rings. We do not want to have here the same calamities as have happened in the United States.

MR. PORTER: I am glad that the hon. member (Mr. Houck) mentioned this point. Before this Bill goes into the next stage, it will be considered.

(Take C follows)

On section 5.

MR. HARRY WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, may I say that in professional boxing, it is the practice to have the boxers weigh in, and have to undergo a medical examination at the same time. I think if we do not practice that here, we should.

MR. PORTER: It may be that is done under the provisions of the Act, but I will have to enquire as to whether it is done in all cases. I cannot answer that off hand.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Who is the Commissioner now?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Steele.

MR. NIXON: Is he appointed at the same salary as his predecessor?

MR. PORTER: That will appear in the estimates. I cannot say at the moment.

MR. NIXON: I think Mr. Apps got $5,000.

MR. PORTER: I will have to enquire into that.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): When was Mr. Steele appointed, and what was his occupation before?

MR. PORTER: Secretary of the Commission before being made Commissioner.

MR. MacLEOD: He was promoted?

MR. PORTER: Yes. He was a man familiar with the work of the Commission, and we felt that he had earned the right to promotion.

MR. WALTERS: You have put a tremendous lot of responsibility on this man, and if he is not getting as much as his predecessor, something should be done about it.

MR. MacLEOD: He should be getting at least as much as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: That is not so much.

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Net or gross?

Section 6 agreed to.

Bill No. 94 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 97, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1947", Mr. Welsh.

On Section 1.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr.Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) would give us a careful explanation of this section.

It seems to be a new departure, and I would like to have a clear explanation as to why.

Hon. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Well, Mr. Chairman, in the light of a couple of years experience administering this Act, we found that in some cases the province -- indirectly through the Superannuation Fund -- was actually paying their share to people who, in our opinion, were not entitled to it. They were not the immediate relatives of the person concerned. They were not the wife or child of a dependent, of any kind, and one case came to light, where the amount was paid to a trust company.

We feel that is not the purpose of the Fund, and is not what it was designed for, and works undue hardships on those paying into the Fund, and anticipating benefits from it.

MR. WISMER: This new section would only apply to those

who retired for one reason or another, or died before they were entitled to the regular, normal superannuation allowance.

MR. WELSH: That is right.

MR. WISMER: Their contributions can be repaid to them, and it presumably got into the Act, that such people had a right to some payment? If that is true, should we not stick to the idea that the person involved is the one with the right, and not the one who receives his estate?

MR. WELSH: No. The difficulty was this; in some cases, a person is entitled not only to their own contribution, but also to the provincial contribution, provided they have the requisite number of years service. There is no attempt to deprive a man's estate of the payments he has made. It is the provincial share which is involved.

(Page C-4 follows)

MR. WISMER: Well, why? That is the point we are trying to get at. Why in one case a servants of the province were looked upon as having the type of dependents requiring additional contributions, and another person who may be serving as well, and has earned as much right to have his contributions shared by the province is in a different position. These are determined under this, when we pass it, simply because he has not the right sort of people to pass it on to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I think the particular point of an annuity provision such as this is taking a particular experience, say, 100 people or. 1,000 people, and that such-and-such works out, to where you lose in one case you make in another.

This provision is a comparatively new one. You will recall it was only introduced some year or two ago. This was a straight departure from the usual provisions which apply in a case such as this. In other words, where a man dies, as in the case of a railroad pension, where a railroader may die a year before he becomes pensionable, under many of these annuity provisions, the pension dies with him, and it is taken to be "that is just his hard luck", and his contribution and the company's contribution go into swelling the fund to take care of the actuarial features, so that those who reach the age of pension, receive it in ordinary course.

I think the hon. members of this House will agree that the practice was to take care of the families of persons paying into annuities. We extended that a year or two ago, with the idea of assisting the dependent of those persons who were unfortunate enough to

pass away before the annuity became payable. After all, how far should we carry that principle? In some cases it might be argued that it is a doubtful principle to put in the Act at all, but we wanted to help the widows and the children. I think it is wise to limit it to that, because if you extend these benefits too far, they are extended to people, perhaps nephews and nieces, or perhaps even to those who have no relationship to children of any preferred class of beneficiary. In the end it only increases the costs of the annuity. These things cost money. I think in this case, if we limit it to the wives and children, it is going about as far as we should go. It was never intended that this matter should be carried further afield than that. The purpose was to assist the dependents of the employee.

That, I think, is the principle of the Bill.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) indicated that this amendment is now proposed because some awkward cases had arisen under the section as it now exists. I think some very awkward cases are going to arise under the amendment. There are public servants who have dependents other than widows and children. They may be parents; they may be sisters or invalid relatives who are dependent upon them, and in respect of whom they may now be allowed an income tax deduction or exemption.

If this amendment passes in its present form, I think some extremely difficult cases will arise.

Furthermore, the amendment in its present form constitutes a discrimination against the female employees in the public service -- a very definite discrimination. There

are a great many women in the public service, and they are, in effect, being excluded, or almost entirely excluded by this amendment. I do not think that kind of discrimination is a good thing to write into this Act, or into any Superannuation scheme.

The logic of the thing is most peculiar. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) says we have to draw the line somewhere. If you are drawing the line anywhere, then you are drawing that line on a principle which is really out of place in a superannuation scheme. A superannuation scheme is not a scheme of compassionate allowance, such as some employers used to grant ex gratia to the employees during their lifetime, or to their families upon their deaths.

This is a superannuation scheme, and it should be systematic, and it should have some measure of consistency. It may be said that you departed from consistency --

MR. FROST: I doubt if we should ever have passed this section.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, I cannot quite agree with that. It might be better to let it stay as it is, rather than run into the whole problem of compassionate allowances, which the hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) no doubt would like to avoid, but with which he may be faced if this thing is bad.

I am wondering if the government would think this thing out any further. When the Bill was introduced, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr.Welsh) said something about payments having been made to a trust company. That would indicate considerable confusion, but even if it was a trust company, they were probably acting in the capacity of the

personal representative, the executor or the administrator of the deceased employee.

The point seems quite irrelevant. It does not matter who the executor is, the intention of the present section is to give some protection to dependents of those who have been taken off sooner than were expected, or who have been forced to retire earlier than was expected.

But I am concerned with the discrimination set up here against the female employees. Once again they are to be asked for their contributions to help the male employees. Perhaps if I keep talking long enough, I will get the support of the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail).

That is the effect of this amendment, and without wishing to obstruct anything, I would suggest that the government reconsider this section. I do not think it is sound, and I think at least it deserves reconsideration.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, we run across this difficulty, in drawing these lines in many cases.

Let me give the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) an example. Under the Succession Duties Act, I run across cases, on a number of occasions, where the Succession Duty Act provided for a certain rate of duty in connection with the dependents of the preferred classes. You come across the odd case where perhaps there is a niece or nephew who has actually stood in the place of a child of a deceased person. It is true that the Act -- as does the Dominion Act -- makes some arbitrary provision there. I think if the child, under the Ontario Act, stands in loco parentis to the child for a period of five years during minority, they come under the provisions.

I ran across a case not long ago where the interpretation of that rule did cause a great deal of hardship. But when you get down to changing it, you get down to the old principle, that you really have to draw the line somewhere, if the thing is going to work.

In this particular case here, we must remember that our Act provides for contributions on the part of the employees, and very generous contributions on the part of the government, the employer. I may say that these rates, of course, are calculated, taking into consideration the number of female employees, and so forther.

I recognize that, by and large, you may say it is a little bit unfair to one class or another, but when you consider the problem as a whole, there are compensating things. If you introduce too many provisions such as this, you just simply cannot carry the Act out without increasing the rates. The rates, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knows, have been increased in the last three or four years, I think on a number of occasions. I have some recollection of one or two of the first budgets I brought in making provision for increasing the contributions on the part of both the employees and the government.

The fact is that what is wanted is to give protection to the employees, and we extended the principle to include wives and children.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knows that under the Teachers' Superannuation Act, until fairly recently, there was no provision for widows or children, and I think that created a terrific situation. We extended that in this case, the idea being if an

employee dies or retires from the service, we give him the advantage, if possible, of the benefits of the amounts which were paid in, including the amounts given by the government.

You can only carry that so far, but it would seem to me if you limit it, as in this section, to widows and children, it is true there may be some hardship. I will not argue for a moment there are not, but after all, by and large, taking the problem and viewing it as a whole, we try to arrive at the best solution possible.

At the time this section was introduced, there was a good deal of doubt as to whether the section should be introduced at all or not, but it seemed to be a fair and reasonable thing to do, provided you did not carry the operation of it too far. I think under the circumstances this is a fair arrangement, and in this case there has not been any objection from the Civil Service Association to the section.

After all, they are interested in the soundness of the Fund itself, and it is on that basis, in many ways their future depends. We have to adopt a principle in these thing and perhaps some may have to lose here and there, in order that somebody else may gain.

That is the principle of this Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The principle was adopted when section 25 was passed.

In effect, the passing of this section will repeal --

MR. FROST: Well -- restrict it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: With the exception of a few people, who I suspect will be in the minority of those who retire or die

before their time, when it is proposed to cut out the rights of a large number of public servants, we are at a very different point of consideration and objective to where we stood when section 25 was originally written.

MR. FROST: This does not affect their own contributions. This is the contribution by the government.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know that, but under section 25, as it now stands, there is also the right of an equivalent contribution, because section 25 provides for double the amount. That was a statutory right, which it is now proposed you are going to take away from most of these people, and I cannot see any basis or any logic for taking it away.

MR. FROST: I would not say "from many people". In a great majority of cases there are wives and children who are concerned in the matter. This limits the giving of the provincial contributions to wives and children. Actually speaking, what happens to the government contribution is this; if a person retires, and has none of this preferred class of beneficiaries, the government contribution simply remains in the Fund, and it becomes available to somebody else. There is no benefit to the government. The contributions are there, and they stay there to help swell the Fund, and better the actuarial soundness of the Fund.

I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree that we have to draw the line somewhere. We went quite a ways when we introduced this section in the Act a year or two ago. I think it has been found that it is better in the interests of everyone, including those who would be subject to superannuation, to limit the benefits to those cases which we think are of real necessity, that is,

to the widows and children. I think that is the explanation.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a little more than that involved here. I can go along with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if this really referred to people who retired on their own volition, of their own free will. But the wording of section 25, as now to be amended, is "having attained retiring age". In other words, the government requires them to retire -- in other words, the employer, not the individual employee. No matter how long an employee may have been in the public service, the provision of section 25 was obviously a condition of employment. There was a certain security to be attained, and it seems to me if you were going to draw a line, surely that line ought to be where the employee retires on his or her own free will. Where it is a condition that at a certain age, you must retire, then it seems to me the rights should remain the same at that point as they were at the beginning.

In other words, it ought not to be a condition of the Fund that you must have some particular kind of a dependent and then you will receive a certain amount, but i you have have another type of dependent, you will receive only one half of it.

That is the sort of thing I think is a very dangerous principle to write in to superannuation legislation at this date. Whatever may be argued by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) as to the compensating consideration, I think it is very dangerous, to now start changing things and really char ing the right of the individuals in the Fund, on a basis of something that is completely outside the control of this

government or the control of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

I think we should look at it this way, Mr. Chairman; that if any of us take employment which involves a superannuation fund or a retiring fund, we want to think of that as something into which we, as individuals, contribute, and if possible into which the employers contribute, and that it makes allowances as section 25 does in its old state, due to the fact that you started in your employment late, and therefore have to retire relatively early, and have not paid in long enough for the annuity to become effective, the employees contribution, as well as your own, has been earned. The employee has earned both, but it may even be that because a man's wife is dead, he will receive nothing.

I think this is a very important point, and I think it should be given very considerable reconsideration before this section passes.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the remark by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that unless we placed some restrictions, the restrictions on the Act, we faced the necessity of raising the rates of the superannuation fund. Of course, we want to be sure that we alleviate the necessity of raising rates except on a basis that is just and equitable. We do not want to keep the rates where they are, if we mean to attain that goal and objective, if in doing so are going to be unfair, or if they are going to be discriminatory in character.

I completely agree with the hon. Leader of the

Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in the remarks he has made on this particular subject this afternoon, and I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) that he not proceed with this particular legislation at the moment, because to me, it is clearly discriminatory. It seems to me that it does discriminate against women particularly One can think at the moment of a woman in employment in the government service having as her dependent an aged parent, having as her dependent an incapacitated husband, or having as her dependent some invalid sister or brother. It does seem to me, Mr.Chairman, that we are goi g very far afield in seeking to save that small portion of provincial money we put into this fund, if we are going to deprive these people, who, in my judgment, are very worthy dependents, and, moreover, Mr. hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in many, many cases, as you know quite well, this employee would be able to claim exemption of income tax for having this dependent, and yet at one and the same time, we as a province, deprive that person of the right of receiving the full amount, even though she is able to claim and prove that this or that person is dependent upon her income for sustenance and support.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied to hold this section over. The recommendation comes from the Civil Service Commissioner,and I will have a discussion with him as to the background of the situation.

We felt it was fair to the people. But, on the other hand, remember when we get into annuities on a broad basis, we have to have the principle that there are certain annuitants who do not make as much as others.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Let them deprive the men for a change.

MR. FROST: You may find in this change that it is the men who are involved, and not the women.

However, I will get a report from the Civil Service Commissioner.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I ask two questions, and perhaps we could be informed about them later.

The first question is I think section 25, which has been in effect since March, 1948 -- in the 1947 Act; in other words, we have nearly two years experience -- perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) could inform us, if the matter comes up, in just how many cases the difficulty has arisen of a kind he mentioned, and how much has been involved. In other words, what has the fund lost by reason of the payments to what you might call "strangers" to the estates of the public servants?

The other question which perhaps can be answered later, or today; it does not matter -- is whether this particular point has been discussed with the Civil Service Association, as well as with the Civil Service Commission.

MR. FROST: We will get that information.

Section 1 stands.

Section 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 97 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th order, House in Committee on Bill No. 100, "The Provincial Parks Act, 1950", Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr.Speaker, in section 2, there was a little error in the description of the property of Ipperwash Park, and I wish to move the following amendment, seconded by Mr. Doucett:

> "Section (2) of the above Bill creates Ipperwash Provincial Park and describes the Park. There is an error in the description in the lot number. This should be Lot 8 and not Lot B as shown. Further, in looking up the deed on file by which the Department acquired title in 1937, the description shows the Lot and Concession according to Registered Plan.
>
> "I am waiting for Mr. McTavish to call in order to clear the wording of the new description which should be incorporated in the Bill printed for third reading after discussion in Committee. However, I believe the description will be approved as follows:
>
> "(2) The public lands known as Lot 8, Concession A, in the Township of Bosanquet, in the County of Lambton, according to Plan No. 23, registered in the Registry Office for the County of Lambton, are hereby reserved and set apart as a provincial park to be known as 'Ipperwash Provincial Park'."

That was an error in the original Bill, as introduced.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) if that is all or part of what was Ipperwash Camp.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): It is the registered plan of the Park, and this is a description taken from that registered plan.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What was it formerly?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): It was known as Ipperwash Provincial Park, but was never put in the Provincial Parks Act. It was treated as a provincial park.

The amendment agreed to.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 3 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 100 reported.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report a certain resolution, certain Bills with amendments, and one Bill without amendment, and progress on another Bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr.Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report a certain resolution, certain Bills without amendment, one Bill with amendment, and progress on another Bill, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

(Take D-1 follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 17.

THE AUDIT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th order, second reading of Billnumber 90,"The Audit Act, 1950," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I move second reading of Billnumber 90, "The Audit Act, 1950," but on this condition: If any of the members desire to discuss this Bill on second reading I will hold it over. I would like to go ahead with it. I would like to get ahead withthe debate on the Speech from the Throne.

This Act is a review of the old Audit Act and there are a number of matters that might better be disaussed in committee than on second reading. There are no great changes from the other Bill except to modernize it.

If my friends opposite desire to di it on second reading I will hold it over.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): The only suggestion I have to offer is that if we want to be fair about this thing, this is a revision of a Bill that has been in existence since 1908, and we should refer a Bill like this to the Public Accounts committee.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I quite recognize that the auditor is an officer of the Assembly and I wish all the hon. members to be satisfied. I know that the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) has considered this. I was almost going to call it the "Brown Bill." I am prepared to hold it over if it appears that there are further revisions required, I will be glad to consider them.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Hold it over. There are some provisions that should be discussed in second reading.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Is there a possibility

that this Bill can go to the Public Accounts Committee after second reading?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): The auditor is an officer of the House and I am anxious that the Audit Act should fully protect the House. The auditor is an important public officer, and I am anxious that the greatest of care should be taken.

Mr. Chairman, I do now move that the committee do rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain Bills, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 2.

DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of this Session.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. M. PHILLIPS (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to get in line with the other hon. members who offered their congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech.

I would also like to offer a warm welcome to the most intelligent and best dressed group of children which I have ever seen in any gallery and they are sitting opposite me today, except that we had a group here last Thursday that I think would compare very favorably with those here today.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would certainly like to welcome them and their two teachers from Owen Sound Collegiate Institute.

Mr. Speaker, the walls of this great auditorium have listened to many types of speeches, some great and some not so

(page D-3 follows)

great. The word "auditorium" comes from the Latin"audio.", to hear, and"taurus", the bull. I hope that I do not orate too much"taurus" today. I wish today to speak on two departments, the first is the Department of Agriclture, which is healed by one of the most, if not the most, beloved Ministers of any Department, and I refer to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. L. Kennedy).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PHILLIPS: Our hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has always had the work of our farmers at heart. The hon. member (Mr. Kennedy) has not only brought forward good legislation for the farmers, but at all times he is willing to stretch existing legislation if it benefits the farmers as a whole in this province. Almost every day we hear that agriculture is our basic industry. If that is so we should at al times keep it in first place. In the olden days practically any man could make a living on the farm. That is not true today. The farmer today must be scientifically minded. He must be educated, and not only that, he must have a big stake because it is a large investment today before a man can set up under present-day farming. I think probably our first consideration is the farm boy. The boy born and raised on the farm has a practical knowledge which is invaluable to our nation, but these boys have not been given enough encouragement to remain on the farms. I would like to see our present farm boys be given the same consideration as our war heroes when they returned from overseas under the Land Administration Act. They were given land, stock, implements, they were given them on a small downpayment with minimum interest rates, minimum annual payments and other concessions too numerous to mention. These boys who remained at home on the farm, they did not just work

48 hours a week but almost twice that number of hours, and they provided food for our armies and our allied divisions alike. I would like to say to this House that the food so supplied was essential in helping to win the war and I certainly wish to say now that if we feed the many starving nations of today it will be the one thing and the most important thing that will forever keep the peace.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few minutes in the interests of our junior farmers. I would like to make a few suggestions.

We should provide capital tothem at reasonable rates, say two or three per contum., on long-term loans so that the young farmer can be set up with modern machinery. The farm boy of today needs modern machinery---a tractor, etc.,---and without that he is just like the farm boy at my age that would be asked to use a team of oxen instead of horses.

My second suggestion is to give assistance to farmers with more than one son. The average farmer of today can only provide for the first son, and the second son goes to the city. That is a disastrous situation. Surely some assistance should be given to the second, the third and fourth boys, and probably we might spend part of the money we are now spending bringing immigrants into Ontario, and divert it towards aiding our own Canadian farmers.

I realize th t our Department of Agriculture has done a great dea for the farmers, but one thing that is lacking is research into animal diseases.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think that is as important as soil fertility and conservation.

When we come to hydro, I think hydro can be judged to be the greatest single factor that has improved our farm life.

It has lowered the drudgery and it has brought a great deal of happiness to our farm people. Here I would like to thank our vice-chairman for what he has done.

In 1943 less than 15% of the farmers in Grey County had lights. Today we have almost 40%, 38% I think to be exact, but there is still one thing that needs correction, and that is the cost of the installation. The cost of installation to farmers is almost beyond his control and we should do something to help the farmers instal hydro and give hydro to every farmer in this great province of ours.

My next suggestion has to do with the land itself. In Grey County we have a great deal of waste land, and here I wish to congratulate our government for the setting up af a committee under the able leadership of the hon. member from Elgin (Mr. Thomas).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PHILLIPS: I understand that they are going to bring in a report in a very few days and I know they will give us some very excellent solutions to our problems. In my own County of Grey I would lik to give a few suggestions regarding our agricultural problem. In certain areas we need tile drainage. Tile drainage aids capillary moisture in the soils and I am told it gives better crops in dry seasons as well as in moist seasons.

Then we have flood control and reforestation. These two cannot be separated. 30% of our land should be reforested. In Grey County we have a great deal of waste land denuded of trees and covered with stones and hawthorns, etc., whichcould easily be cleared and either reforested or else placed in cultivation. I think that grantsto aid our farmers in old Ontario is equally as important as grants to help our northern friends. There is a great deal that could be done to

improve the land and farms and this would relieve the unemployment situation and it would provide food for our own people and also the people of all the nations of the world.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like toffer my cohgratulati ns to the many farm organizatioms in Grey County. We have junior farmer organizations and we have the Women's Institute and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the Women's Institute has done for farm life in Ontario more than any other body; and we have the Grey County Federatiom of Agriculture which wasorganized in 1940. These organizations since inceptionhave to depend on grants from the various township councils and county councils. They are very thankful for these grants but they also know that should the personnel of these councils be changed from year to year and if they should meet up with unfavorable councils, then their grants would cease and they would founder on the rock of destruction.

The farmers are producers or manufacturers, and they are the only ones in this category who have very little to say inthe price of their products. They feel that it is only fair that they should be allowed to take charge of certain concessions. These concessions are not charged to the consumer as most other manufacturers' products but it is charged to themselves. They would like to charge concessions of one-half per centum. to their own products whether it is bees, or cattle or hogs, etc. And the money would provide a fund from which their organizations could do business.

Now, we have heard a great deal about subsidies. We have heard in this House the pros and the cons. A subsidy, to me, is something like a doctor giving medicine to a sick man to cure him, but never cures him, and the farmers tell

me they do not wish subsidies or handouts, but they do want freedome t determine for themselves and collect for themselves such assessments that will prove sufficient to adequately finance their program.

Being a medical man I think smme of thehon. members must have felt, including thehon.member immediately to my south (Mr. Parry) and the leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver), they must have thought that I should stay out of farming and such things and concentrate on health and welfare. They are right.

So the second part of my talk today is going to be on the subject of health and welfare. I might say that just the same as agriculture is our basic industry, so good health is the basic commodity of any progressive state. In Canada, in Ontario and in my own riding in North Grey we are faced with a terrific problem, and that is the question of hospitalization. Hospitals are in business for one fundamental purpose and that is giving adequate medical, surgical, obstetrical and hospital care for everyone, irrespective of their ability to pay. The patient who is able to pay should pay, but the indigent patient who usually is indigent through no fault of his own, in my opinion is the responsibility of the State and not of an hospital board. The person who is paying for private or semi-private wards should not have to bear part of the costs of the care of the indigent patients.

I feel the time has come when hospitals should be capable of providing hospital services to the indigent---and the government---all three---Federal, provincial and municipal should have the right to make sure that hospitals are economically operated and that there should be no waste.

To day our governments are assuming practically full

responsibility for our mental cases, tuberculosis, cancer and certain other chronic conditions and they are being called on by prublic opinion to provide adequate hospital services for every citizen of the province. Public opinion is demanding that they should provide adequate hospital service for every citizen.

Let me say here that I believe that this whole problem is too large for any municipality or one government,---that the only safe and sane method of solving this must be from the Federal government with provincial and municipal participation. If we are going to give people medical care, and hospital care, I feel it should be done by some compulsory system whereby the carriers would be voluntary, like the Blue Cross, and the subscribers would, if able to pay, pay for their own coverage and that of their dependents and the government pay the coverage for all indigents. It may be that when the present costs of hospitalization for indigents paid by the municipalities and the provinces are offset against this proposal, the difference would not be very appreciable. It would mean, however, that the municipalities and the province would be on a stated formula and they could budget accordingly for the complete and adequate coverage of every single individual. I know that in Ontario, certainly in my own riding, the people feel that the per diem cost of the patient in our hospitals are altogether too high. Our hospitalization is $9.80 per patient per day. But just let us realize that a hospital has to provide for three labor days, three 8-hour shifts, without any extra production. In fact when you allow for the employees having their regular time off the hospital boards really have to make up four days every twenty-four hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the main thing that causes

the per diem rate in our hospitals to be so high.

Now, and I think I probably should say it again, I want you to keep in mind that what I am speaking of now cannot be done by any provincial government, it cannot be done in a satisfactory manner by any one provincial government---it has to be done by the whole Dominion of Canada.

Let us look at the province of British Columbia. They went into the hospital business in 1946, when the costs of their hospital services amounted to $9,000,000. By 1949 that cost had jumped to $15,000,000, and this year the estimates are over $17,000,000. Hon. members, I think that shows us just how terrific, how grim, this hospital problem is.

I also understand that the province of Manitoba is trying to make a deal withthe Blue Cross to have a coverage for all their people.

In this Ontario of ours with 4,000,000 people we have about one-half covered by the Blue Cross.

Now, I do not think that this government or any other government, especially provincial, should enter into the hospital business any more than entering into the business of building houses.

(Take E follows)

I think that this should be left to organizations, such as the Blue Cross, which has proven that they are experts in this business.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): In more ways than one.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think probably, as a medical man, I come closer in touch with this, than probably some of the other hon. members of this House. If you saw the number of insurance health policies which are supposed to cover everything, but when the patient meets up with some condition, and finds there is a loop-hole in the policy, then he does not get anything. But I can say this for the Blue Cross -- remember, I would like to see the Blue Cross do more; I think they are going to do more -- at least they have done exactly what they say they will do in that little two-page policy which they issue. I have never yet seen the Blue Cross turn down a case which is contrary to whatever they have agreed to do.

Now, I would like to speak for a moment on our own local problem in Owen Sound.

In Owen Sound, we have an 89-bed hospital, what is officially called a "90-bed hospital". We had last year, usually about 120 patients there all the time. I am sorry to say we have had to make our private rooms into semi-private. Well, that was not so bad, but when we added eight beds in a public ward where there should only be four, where we have beds in the halls, which is contrary to fire regulations as well as everything else, then that condition is getting serious.

What the hospital board and the doctors are afraid of is that some day somebody's health may be jeopardized due to the fact that they cannot get into the hospital . They may even die.

In Owen Sound, we have the best facilities possible. We have one of the best radiological departments in Canada. We have an A-1 radiologist, in the person of Dr. Gordon Franklin. We have A-1 laboratory services, operating-room services; our personnel is much better than average, and when I speak of "personnel" I mean the nurses at the heads of the different services, and also the surgeons and anaesthetists who have come to Owen Sound after they have had special training.

We also have a very active board. Our hospital board has given of their time and their efforts freely and unstintingly. Our superintendent, Mr. Clarke, and our lady instructress, Miss Cooke, have worked very hard for the hospital . But the situation is getting beyond them. They are up against a stone wall.

In order to cope with this situation, we should have a 150-bed hospital, and allow our own hospital to be used for the chronically ill.

I might also state that our hospital services a city of 15,000 people, and another 50,000 people from the north halves of Grey and Bruce counties. Since neither the counties of Grey or Bruce have a provincial building, they might proceed with the experiment of building a standard hospital at Owen Sound.

I think the greatest stumbling-block in any hospital insurance scheme is the lack of hospital beds. More and more people wish to be treated in hospital. We are treating today three times as many patients in our hospitals as we did twenty years ago. In 1928, we had three million patient days -- I will give you these in round figures -- in 1938 we had four million, and in 1948, six million patient days.

I have always felt that this congestion in our hospital amongst the acutely-ill, could be relieved by removing the convalescent cases to a nursing home or nursing hospital, where the per diem rate would be cut in two, and also I think a great deal could be done for treating more patients in the homes. If we are going to do that, we would have to have a central place, where hospital beds, heat lamps, and so forth, could be kept, and we would have to have nursing sisters visit these homes, but a great deal could be done to relieve the acute congestion in our hospital, if these patients could be moved to the homes where we had a little bit of special training, and more of these things to work with.

I would like to look at the particular picture in the counties of Grey and Bruce, with the centre of population in Owen Sound.

In the last few years, we have had hospitals built at Chesley, Southampton, Wiarton, Markdale, and I think this year at Beeton. These hospitals are small -- about twenty beds -- but beside putting in the ordinary equipment in these hospitals, they have put in expensive specialized equipment, such as x-rays, operating-room set-ups, and so forth, but the great trouble is in those places they have no trained personnel to use this expensive equipment. What is happening every day is this; say an accident happens in one of those places, fifteen or twenty miles from Owen Sound. They are taken to one of these little hospitals, and perhaps have an x-ray. They have no radiologists there, and they are taken to the operating-room, and the doctor there finds that this man needs special treatment, and he is taken to Owen Sound, where he perhaps has to have another x-ray taken, and is taken to the operating-room, and finally he receives the specialized

treatment which he needs.

What I am trying to point out to the hon. members of this House is that we should, as far as we can, do away with these duplications of expensive equipment and services.

We might take a lesson from the way things were run overseas during the last war by the Army Medical Corps, where they placed their hospital units, not out in the field -- these hospital units had expensive equipment, but they also had highly-trained personnel. They did not place these units out in the field; they placed them in strategic places, and then out in the field, they had field ambulances, field dressing stations, and casualty clearing stations, which treated the minor cases, sorted out the other cases, and sent them in to the hospital units for specialized treatment.

This could be carried on very nicely under a broad hospitalization program in this great country of ours.

I do not want to leave the impression that I think it was poor business to place these hospitals in the smaller places. They need those hospitals badly. What they really need is probably twenty or twenty-five beds in each hospital with a medical set-up, a good obstretical set-up, and not have all this expensive equipment. These hospitals could be operated for perhaps fifty per cent -- in fact, less than fifty per cent -- of what the hospital costs are in such a hospital as the one in Owen Sound.

Let me point out one thing. In these smaller nursing hospitals, for every three or four patients, they need about one employee. I have heard some say that it requires one employee for three patients, others have said one employee for four patients. In most of our active hospitals, we can hardly get along with one employee to one patient. In fact,

a great number of our active hospitals have more than one employee per patient.

Now, another headache is our maintenance problem. Last year the Owen Sound Hospital amassed a deficit of $43,000. If that was the only hospital in Ontario which had amassed a deficit, I would say there was something locally wrong. But that is not so. I see where the Kitchener hospital amassed a deficit of $78,000., and the city council of Peterborough was asked for $80,000. to meet the hospital deficit in 1950.

The actual cost of keeping a patient in our hospitals is $9.80 per day. We had 2,846 indigent patients, and our municipalities only pay $2.25 for each of those indigent patients, per day. That means a loss of $7.55 per day.

Our hospital lost $21,487., and you might say that one-half of our entire deficit was caused by the indigent patients.

Now, of these 2,846 indigent patients, forty-seven per cent were from Owen Sound, forty-four per cent from Grey county, and about eight per cent or nine per cent from Bruce county.

Now, just to show you how a hospital loses out on indigent patients, I would like to cite one case. We had a female indigent patient coming into our hospital for twenty-eight days.

(Take F follows)

The regular rate of our public ward was $5.50 a day. Then there are extra charges made for X-rays, operating room, laboratory work and costly drugs. This lady had the use of these services, including the supplying a lot of these costly drugs. 28 days at $5.50 a day is $154.00; her extras, if she had been an extra patient, would have amounted to $188.00, making a total of $342.00. Our hospital had to give a receipt in full to the municipality from which that indigent came, for 28 days at $2.25 a day, or $63.00. Instead of their receiving $342.00, they received $63.00, a loss of $279.00.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew); Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member (Mr. Phillips) mind answering a question? Does he not agree, then, that the provincial government should use the revenue it derives from the amusement tax to pay the muhicipalities the extra cost for maintaing indigent patients?

MR. PHILLIPS: I was just coming to that. Now, this deficit of $43,000 is in spite of the good work of our Department of Health, and I certainly wish to thank the Department, headed by the hon. Mr. Kelley, whom I am very sorry to hear is ill at the present time, In 1942 the grants to our hospital were a little over $2000. In 1948, they were $7970, which you might say is $8000---all but $30. This year, due to what both hon. members spoke about, the grant to our hospital has gone up to $9300.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Excuse me. Does the hon. member (Mr. Phillips) have any idea what is collected from this tax in Owen Sound?

MR. PHILLIPS: I am sorry, I do not.

MR. MacLEOD: It might interest you to find out.

MR.PHILLIPS: In conclusion, I would just like to say that I hope I have given this House something constructive

towards our hospital problem. I would like to see such a consideration given to isolated places such as Owen Sound, which in our district is the natural hospital centre and I know throughout Ontario and Canada there must be otherplaces the same as Owen Sound, who are natural hospital centres, geographically and also from the standpoint of the centre of large populations. The over-all picture could be studied and something like I pointed out about our medical corps, some of that could be used, and duplication of expensive services could be eliminated.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, with the help of all our citizens and with the Federal government taking the lead, and with participation of the provinces and of all the municipalities, I feel this great problem could be solved.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I am very pleased to have the opportunity of congratulating you personally on the way you have handled your difficult job as Speaker of this House since you have assumed the position. We, in the opposition, think very highly of the very fair way that you deal with the problems that come before you, and even when you get up to stifle us, almost invariably you will hear one of our hon. members say "Thank you."

I was very pleased indeed to hear about the improvement in health of the hon. Russell T. Kelley, one of our other hon. members for Hamilton. We miss him very much. It seems when there are only three members out of four representing Hamilton riding and district, we are something like a horse that has three good legs and the other no use at all.

AN hon. MEMBER: Spavined.

MR. EASTON: We still do our best to carry on. I would

like at this time to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne. They were very, very lucid and theyhave the gift of expressing themselves very well. They seem to bring a breath of fresh air into this Assembly.

MISS MACPHAIL (York, East): Yes, Conservative fresh air.

MR. EASTON: I only wish it could carry across the Chamber onto the other side.

Those who have seen the listof speakers will take note that I changed places with the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder). I do not want it to be interpreted that I am seeking the leadership of the Liberal Party.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. EASTON: I have no desire to be a large frog in a small puddle, nor do I desire to become the best dressed "frog."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. EASTON: Now I think I should get around to my speech.

AN hon. MEMBER: I think it would be better.

MR. EASTON: There are two very, very important items which I think I should deal with, and though they have been dealt withat considerable length by some of the other speakers, I would also like to deal with them. These two seem to stand out above the rest, and they are the problems of unemployment and the lowering of farm prices.

Last year I spent some time extolling the advantages of Hamilton-Wentworth. Now this problem of farm prices and unemployment seems to be applicable to a riding such as mine, which is 75% rural, 25% urban. I was going to make some remarks about the advantages of it, but I did that last year; however,

I want to draw the attention of this House to a beautiful booklet called "Ontario," put out by the Department of the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile). Although I searched from end to end through all the beautiful pictures, I did not see any reference to Hamilton or Wentworth.

AN hon. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. EASTON: In order thatthe Department may not make that same mistake again, I am going to send over to the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile)---and I regret he is out of the House at the moment--two little booklets which I hope will be placed on his desk and that he will read them at the first opportunity he has.

In discussing the problem of unemployment and farm prices, I do not wish to speak as an apostle of gloom, nor do I wish to speak as an expert economist. Rather am I striving to seek the answer to the questions which the man in the street will undoubtedly ask this government if these problems get out of hand.

In the city of Hamilton the unemployment situation is causing a great deal of concern. The number of jobless males in Hamilton is around the 5000 mark, yet the unemployment in the constructions trades stands at 850, approximately one-sixth of the whole, so we must not accept the view that this unemployment is seasonal and will right itself when the sun shines on both sides of the fence.

One of the key industries in my riding is the National Steel Car, which manufactures rolling stock, and which has laid off most of its employees. This has caused further layoffs in foundries and other allied trades. Should the Canadian railway companies settle the question of adequate freight rates and wages, I have no doubt orders will be placed, related of course to the degree of settlement arrived at. No doubt the

recently announced increase in freight rates will result in the placing of some orders.

The picture inthe textile industry is not good. Reductions in staff has taken place in most plants in varying degrees. According to radio and press reports, I hear similar conditions exist in the Ottawa Valley and in other textile centres throughout Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of this House to the recent importation of Japanese shirts into this country. Japanese dress shirts are being sold for $1.19 in Toronto and Montreal. They are offering to supply rayon sport shirts for 75¢.

I believe these imports, if allowed to continue, will sound the death knell of the shirt industry in Canada. We have one or two such shirt factories in Hamilton and quite a few primary textile plants who will feel the impact of these imports.

According to the latest figures released in 1948 by the International Labor Office, which is a branch of the United Nations, girls in the textile industry in Japan are being paid 35¢ a day. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly exploitation of the worker of the very worst kind, and it certainly is unfair competition to our workers in this country. I want to saythis very forcibly: Our Canadian and American boys did not lay down their lives in order to perpetuate this industrial slavery, and I say it behooves all of us, including the two large labor Congresses in this country, to protest to Washington, which is the capital of the administrative power of this perpetuation of slavery which Abraham Lincoln himself condemned and helped to abolish in their own country.

I saw the effect of this unfair competition in my own home town in the Old Country back in 1936. On a visit there, I saw textile workers pulling down cotton mills, pulling apart

th machinery and crating it ready to ship out to Japan, Egypt and India, not leaving one stone upon another. The wages they were receiving were 14¢ an hour. Can you imagine what heartbreak these men must have felt, pulling down their means of livelihood and shipping it across the ocean to intensify further the competition they were receiving from those Eastern countries? It can happen here. Do not say it cannot. We do not want to see empty textile factories in Canada.

British textiles also are being laid down here to give serious competition to our own manufactured goods. We believe the blame for this is the dollar situation. No doubt the need for Great Britain to earn dollars here to spend in turn in Canada to buy our farm products has influenced the Dominion Government to encourage British imports of manufactured goods. To what extent this is going to be allowed to displace Canadian workers is the terrific responsibility of the Dominion Government, though it is obvious that a certain balance must be kept if the farmers are not going to lose some of their domestic market also.

I realize that Canada cannot live unto itself and that healthy world trade is a necessity, but before we blame the loss overseas markets and overproduction of farm products for the difficulties that are now confronting us, we should further examine the potential domestic market. Let us look at some of the figures.

Recent surveys in Canada show that 30% to 40% of the entire Canadian population use little or no milk. This is astonishing in a country so rich in milk and milk products. Tomatoes are used regularly in about half of Canadian homes. Personally I prefer canned Canadian tomatoes to the soapy offerings that come to us at this time from over the border.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. EASTON: It is obvious that an advertising campaign at this time, pointing out the merits of Ontario tomatoes, would benefit the canning industry. Other fruits such as apples and peaches are almost entirely neglected by one-third of the entire population.

Do those figures indicate a huge surplus in production of agricultural products? I do not believe they do. Rather do they point out the fact that purchasing power is inadequate.

Why should I say that when wages in Canada are at an all-time high? You should ask the fellow who has been compelled to purchase a high-priced home, helped in many cases by the Ontario second mortgage loans.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You are advertising the hon. member for Prince Edward's (Mr. Baxter) business there.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): That is all right. He is a Canadian.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): You want to eat some tomatoes, George, (hon. Mr. Dunbar) you will catch up.

MR. EASTON: I willhave to get back towhere I was. I was saying you should ask the fellow who has been compelled to buy one of these high-priced homes. Ask him how much he has left. After he has made his principal and interest payments and paid his taxes, he has not a great deal left to pay the food bills.

People on fixed incomes, like pensioners and otherlow income groups, have to buy less in the face of today's high prices. Ways and means must be found to see that we do not repeat the follies of the hungry 30s when farm products were destroyed and people starved. If some farm products are declared surplus thruugh bounty of harvest or for any other

reason, these surpluses should be distributed through the low income groups, not destroyed or stored in great quantities, because this latter method has always a depressing effect on farm prices.

We are not breaking new ground in this. How many of you remember inthe 30's when the stocks of butter in this country were so high that they gave it away to the unemployed? What are we going to do with the surplus of butter that we have here now? Our old age pensioners could use it. Why do we not offer to buy some from the Dominion Government at bargain rates and distribute it to the needy in the province to supplement their diet?

The United States Government is now offering potatoes at one cent a pound, in order to dispose of the surplus. Spain is taking two boat loads and will probably take more if they are delivered in good condition. They are thinking of distributing surplus foods to the schools as part of the lunch program in United States schools. Another plan is to give it to charitable institutions and Indian reservations. The time is rapidly coming when we also will have to think of ways to distribute surplus farm products. Should we not consider lower prices for those on low incomes and on pension, and those drawing unemployment insurance? Welfare buying agencies, hospitals, prisons and provincial institutions of that description should have the opportunity to purchase at lower levels. This would help municipal taxpayers throughout the country.

There is a huge market in the United States for Canada's fruit and vegetable products at certain times of the year, but a great deal of it is cut out by a duty of 25% on vegetables as against a 10% duty on United States vegetables coming into this country.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. EASTON: It is unfortunate that the province has no say at present in regard to tariffs. The Canadian Horticultural Council, meeting in convention at Ottawa, is demanding that the government find means of placing them on a more equitable trading basis with the United States producers, and, to that end, have passed resolutions, one of them asking the United States to reduce the duty on vegetables from the present 25% to 12½%. Another resolution was to reduce the maximum 75% duty on Canadian potatoes. Failing this, they asked the government to put tariffs on United States potatoes, which are now allowed to come in duty free. There are other tariff inequalities which should be straightened out, and if we throw our support behind the producers, we may get something done.

I have some figures on unemployed here, but inasmuch as some of thehon. members have spoken about the large number of unemployed, I do not wish to repeat all that, but I do want to say that more than 350,000 people are out of work today, just twice as many as were unemployed last February. Can we look for much improvement in the near future. Can the farmers hope to dispose of their produce if we do not get back to full employment?

It is interesting to note the seven specific demands upon the Federal government that were submitted by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in a brief presented to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) and Cabinet on February 9th. The first one was permanent price-support legislation. The second was the re-establishment of the $36 per hundredweight of bacon, seaboard level until July 1st or such time thereafter as is necessary to fill the United Kingdom contract. Third, price-support for eggs be increased from 38¢

to 42¢ per dozen.for grade A large. Fourth, that cheese prices for 1950 be maintained at the same level, namely 30¢, F. O. B. the factory. Fifth, that the floor price for butter be maintained at 58¢ a pound. Sixth, extension ofthe present powers of the Wheat Board so that t willcontinue to be the sole marketing agency in wheat, and a protest that the government has postponed deliveries of wheat so as to finance British purchases of other products, thereby weakening the prestige of the Wheat Board. Seventh, that the Wheat Board be empowered beyond July 1st to remain the sole marketing agency for coarse grains.

It seems to me that the farmers have not abandoned principles of free enterprise. Surely you can see that the laws of supply and demand are not being allowed to work and will not be allowed to work in the face of the growing surpluses that are accumulating today throughout Canada.

In the face of all these danger signals to our farming economy and of the rising tide of unemployment, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) tells us to be cheerful, that he is an optimist about the future, that we should like upon the bright side of life. Frankly, I cannot. The other night when I was thinking about what to say in my speech, I heard a song on the radio which seemed to go like this, and it seemed to reflect the government's whole attitude towards unemployment and the lowering of farm prices:

"Enjoy yourself, it's later than you think,
"Free enterprise will save you from the brink,
"We will stick to it no matter if we sink,
"Enjoy yourself, enjoy yourself, it is later than you think."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. EASTON: I would like now to make a few comments

on the announcement made by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) last Friday. His announcement of the $150,000,000 five-year program for highways was certainly very welcome now to the people of Ontario. One thing it did do was tomake me redraft part of my speech.

I must now convey the expression of satisfaction that I have heard on every hand at the government's decision to eliminate the Burlington Beach bottleneck. This is the best news that my constituents who live along the Beach have heard in a long while.

(Take G follows)

They are hoping that life will be again worth living in the summertime, and the damage to life and limb is removed when trying to cross the highway. We realize the engineering difficulties are great, and that federal assistance should be requested for some means of crossing the canal. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) -- he is not listening --

Hon. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Yes, I am.

MR. EASTON: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) tell this House, has he reached any agreement with the federal government as to making this a joint enterprise. There is nothing in the federal estimates for our district covering that. Perhaps I am a little too anxious to get this job going, but I know what good it can do to help the industrial, the business and unemployment situation in our district.

I would like at this time to extend my thanks to the Department of Lands and Forests, to the government, for the very enjoyable and educational trip which they provided last fall for the hon. members of the Legislature.

Not all the printed words in existance could have described to me the vastness, the richness and the beauty of this great province of ours. The arrangements were of the finest, and the vaunted hospitality of the North was evidenced on every hand. I like the north and I like the people. They are the pioneers, the builders, the life blood in the development in our mining industry and our pulp and paper and logging industry, our power development, and the new towns that are springing up in the north.

We should do everything to encourage them, and their pleas for roads should be acceded to wherever possible.

On every hand we found evidence of the machinery and equipment that is manufactured in southern Ontario, which is also helping in the development of the north. This development will enrich us all; new roads will enable us to ship our fruit and vegetables into the areas at less cost and in larger amounts than before. This great north of ours needs more population, I am convinced of that, but they should be brought in under financial assistance development schemes that will guarantee them assistance until they are self-sustaining.

I was pleased to see an announcement that 10,000 Hollanders are going into the Rainy River District, and that plans are going forward to bring more. This is all to the good, and I want to say this, I shall be able to deliberate the problems of the north with a far better understanding than I had previous to my trip up there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with respect to the changes in the system of making grants to municipalities made by this government. I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. member for South Grey (Mr.Oliver) when he said that making grants conditional on the municipalities undertaking certain works was unwarranted interference with the rights of municipal councils, and this had helped to increase the tax rate.

I have received protests from councils in my riding on this subject. The township of Paxton passed a resolution asking that the grants to municipalities revert back to the

one-mill subsidy.

The City of Hamilton will lose $47,000. this year through the change. They will also lose about $70,000. in the change in the educational grants.

Hon. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Do not leave that impression. You know better than that.

MR. EASTON: The Township of Paxton did make such a resolution, and I would be glad to send it across. The City of Hamilton, in their financial statement, show that they will lose $47,000. due to this change.

It seems to me the system of municipal government in Ontario has deteriorated to the status of a vast puppet show, activated by the "octupus of Queen's Park".

With regard to the $70,000. lost in educational grants, that is through the reduced grants that are being made to vocational schools. I would like to say, increase the grants given to vocational schools. We need more of that kind of school. In the long run you will find that more people in Ontario will be wearing overalls than will be wearing white collars, and we should re-adjust our vocational grants to inaugurate vocational schools throughout this province.

In conclusion, I want to say this. In dealing with the urgent problems of unemployment and loss of farm income, the government should not be afraid to try new ideas and methods in this great period of re-adjustment that is now taking place with the dislocation of world markets, the extent of the recovery of the European countries, and the probable termination in 1952 of the Marshall Plan.

Let us do a little pioneering on the matter of welfare and dispose of our new surpluses and put them to good use.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be rather peculiar today that all speakers are dealing, to some extent, with farm production. We know that in a few days' time we will be hearing from the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) and the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) and we know what they will refer to.

I do not know whether the hon. members know this, but when this debate winds up on Thursday, some forty-two members will have taken part.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): What about the other fifty?

MR. MURDOCH: And everyone has had the opportunity to say a few words, and there is still the Budget. And for the hon. member who just spoke, (Mr. Easton) there is no danger of his party missing out. As I remember, they always took part in every debate, and every measure that has been introduced to the House.

As regards the Opposition, I think it is a great thing that they are able to speak on every occasion. They seem to have enjoyed it, and smiled and gesticulated, and since I have no quotes of my own, I will have to borrow -- "enjoy yourself, it is later than you think."

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take my place at this late stage of the debate, I wish to congratulate you on the many felicitations you have received from all the hon. members of this House. From the nature of the congratulations, I am led to hope that the hon. leaders of the Opposition parties will be able to prove the sincerity of their remarks when

this government once again goes to the people.

The C.C.F. Party in Ontario seems to be the counterpart of the Labour Party in Britain, and the hon. members of this Legislature even went to the expense of providing themselves with red roses, to celebrate an extremely doubtful victory.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MURDOCH: They could go one step further and follow their friends, in placing no candidate in the field to oppose you, Mr. Speaker, at the next election. I am almost sure that the Labour-Progressives would "go thou and do likewise", and of course, the Liberal Party always tags along, supporting anything which is good.

By this method, Mr. Speaker, it could be said that you rule this rostrum in permissive perpetuity.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MURDOCH: During this debate I wish to confine my remarks more especially to the farming industry and the farmers of Ontario, because we cannot underestimate the extreme importance of food, -- that vital sustenance without which we cannot live.

The economic position of the farmer is very important to the industries directly supported by the products of the farm, food-processing plants, canning plants, packing plants, chain stores, dairies, creameries, elevators, bakeries, and thousands of restaurants.

The economic position of the farmer is very important also to the manufacturers of farm machinery, tractors, trucks, cars, and all electrical equipment.

All these industries make a profit when the farmer has money to spend. If the farmer makes a profit on his operations, above the fair cost of production, he makes an important con-

tribution toward the support of hundreds of small towns through his every-day purchases of family and personal needs, clothes, radios, and also the products in packages which originated on the farm, and upon which he has paid profits to the processors, the wholesalers, and the retailers.

Mr. Speaker, there is a direct connection between falling farm prices and the growing list of unemployed. It has been stated that the only thing we suffer from in this province of Ontario is abundance, and the situation we find ourselves in today, and the signs on the economic horizon, are much the same as they were when we went into the last depression.

I do not wish to fall into that school of alarmists. We have all the alarmists we need, on the other side of the House. But I do wish to emphasize the extreme importance of maintaining a high level of purchasing power.

If this means government schemes, then I think they should be introduced, and if it means temporary poor prices, this should be done, In the same way to maintain purchasing power, anything should be done to avoid the devastating effects to public welfare.

Properly organized farmers do not wait to depend on the government for the solution of all their problems. They believe in self-help, cooperative action, and producer marketing boards to determine the price of their products.

Some speakers have expressed the opinion that farmers, generally, do not want government controls. At the same time, I do express my opinion that farmers do not wait to return to the pre-war days of unbridled and free speculation and consequent deflation of prices of farm commodities.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: Who advocated the re-opening of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange?

MR. MURDOCH: We know that free and open markets have some affect on the lack of stability of our farms. I will go into that later.

Government controls may be necessary, as has been mentioned, in times of emergency, such as war; farm production has to be geared up to provide vital food products; and also during the return to a peacetime basis when we switch back to a normal peacetime economy.

During this transition period, government subsidies may be necessary, and it has been stated by the Federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) that subsidies will only be of a temporary nature.

(Take H follows)

The question then arises whether farm products should be produced without control or direction and dumped on the speculative supply-and-demand market, followed by ruinous prices and the return to that old system of the survival of the fittest; or if producers should be brought under marketing schemes with quotas and limited production to assure profitable prices.

The overall policy of this Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has always been of a two-fold nature.

> First: labour laws including the Industrial Standards Act to give industrial workers and tradesmen a clear definition of their rates of pay and conditions of employment.
>
> Second: for agriculture, marketing schemes to give the farmer a greater measure of control over the products of the farm. A sincere desire to eliminate profiteering at the expense of the farmer and the consumer.

Under free enterprise, the Government works for the individual, and we realize that some free enterprise Governments of the past have worked to the greater benefit of some classes of people than others, but this Government is working for every class, every group, every segment of our people, with fair play and equal opportunity to all.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MURDOCH: A marketing scheme has many advantages and should work for the benefit of all parties concerned. The primary issue, however, should be to provide some measure of stability in farm income, and the elimination of ruinous prices.

In marketing schemes, we find that the wholesalers and retailers also gain many benefits. They are assured that competitors are paying the same price and that those prices will be stabilized at stated levels for definite periods.

Consumers will ultimately buy at lower prices when market hazards and the operations of speculators are removed.

When such a system has gained the confidence of the wholesaler and retailer, more effort can be directed to salesmanship, and quality control. Advertising schemes could be introduced to move large volumes of produce during peak production periods with a uniform and attractive price, resulting in increased sales and a wider market for farm produce.

These marketing schemes, which have already been established, are working towards the same ends as our labour organizations - to negotiate and bargain, to the ultimate satisfaction of all parties concerned.

During the war, farmers were given the temporary benefit of floor or guaranteed export prices to increase production. This created a feeling of false security, Mr. Deputy Speaker, security which has now vanished as completely as the Liberals and Communists in the recent British Elections.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Yes, that is true of the Liberals but not of the Communists.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MURDOCH: Knowing that these conditions would have to be faced, this Government encouraged farmers to organize into commodity groupes to bring some measure of control and stability in prices in the sale of their products.

As the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has

stated on many occasions - "We want the farmers to have full control over their products right through until they reach the ultimate consumer."

And why should they not?

The manufacturer sets the price of his product at both the wholesale and retail levels. If anyone violates the established and dictated price structure, they lose the privilege of handling the product.

Agriculture is Ontario's largest single industry, and we cannot afford to have a sick industry. We must take a new look at agriculture.

In the first place, we know that the forty-eight hour week, holidays with pay, compensation, pension and medical schemes are all written into the price of farm products between the time they leave the farm and reach the ultimate consumer.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): And also the profits of the manufacturers.

MR. MURDOCH: This party believes in profits. We do not think there is anything wrong with a profit it it is reasonable.

The farmer sells on no such basis. He does not set the price of his product. He sells it on the "market". The market price may not even cover the bare cost of production.

The farmer has no protection from a new type of competition - the gentleman farmer - the lawyer, broker or industrialist - who has bought a farm as a precaution against inflation, and who can charge losses on his farm operations against his personal income.

The Ontario farmer competes with low-priced Mexican labour, through the importation of United States fruits and vegetables.

The Ontario farmer is now competing with low-priced European labour in competitive bids for the British market.

Although trading conditions are generally buoyant ant industry still working in high gear, we find that farmers' markets have taken drastic drops during the past few months.

Our system of marketing is, as I shall prove later, a much greater hazard than the actual surplus.

As we know, on-the-market, buyers make purchases as cheaply as possible under the old law of supply and deman. The cost of production bears no relationship to the prices offered. The farmer's labour is placed on the auction block every time a sale is made, just as surely as slaves were placed on the auction block two hundred years ago.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): That is free enterprise.

MR. MURDOCH: That is progressive free enterprise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Let me point out we on this side of the House know where the mistakes are. However, we do not believe in burning down the barn to get rid of the house.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Who is the mouse?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MURDOCH: We all know what happened to the egg producers when the Federal Government withdrew the floor price, owing to the termination of the British contract. In a matter of a few days the price of eggs to the producer, dropped from 42 cents to 24 cents per dozen.

There was no time during this drastic drop, for any consumer reaction of heavier purchases, until all the damage was done, and yet there was actually no great surplus of eggs.

In the Province of Ontario, production at that time was approximately 70,000 cases of eggs per week, which means a drop in farm income to the egg producers of $400,000. a week.

At that time everyone in the business was panicky. The producer was losing money on every dozen eggs he produced, with his labor thrown in free. Commission dealers, wholesale buyers and chain store operators were all apprehensive over the possibility os still lower prices, and everyone was buying on a hand to mouth basis.

Hatchery operators were flooded with cancellations of orders for baby chicks. Feed dealers were faced with a tremendous cut-back in their sales of feed. In the absence of any organized body of egg producers, everyone in the industry, in an individual way, and in small hurriedly organized groups, put the pressure on the Federal Minister of Agriculture for a subsidy, or floor price.

After definitely stating in the West that there would be no support price for eggs, the Minister recanted and announced his plan for the purchase of eggs, if necessary, at an approximate price of thirty-eight cents.per dozen.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Not necessarily eggs.

(Page H-6 follows)

MR. MURDOCH: I beg your pardon? Immediately after this announcement, confidence returned in some measure to the entire industry and the price of eggs to the farmer rose almost overnight from 24 cents to 32 cents, a decided improvement.

All surplus eggs which could not be absorbed by the domestic market were put into storage on the strength of this offer by the Federal government.

Now come the figures, which prove beyond all shadow of doubt, the utter fallacy of uncontrolled markets for farm products.

Since the price of eggs to the consumer was raised from eight to ten cents per dozen with the Minister's announcement, we could assume, under the old law of supply and demand, that consumers curtailed their buying to some extent.

In spite of this theory, and after five weeks, we can now ask the question, "How many surplus eggs have been put into storage?"

These surplus eggs have all been graded and inspected and counted, and the figures released by the Federal Department of Agriculture show that less than 70,000 cases have been stored up to February 24th and since that date current demand has been absorbing every egg currently produced, and there is every indication that the market is going higher in the immediate future.

Let us look back once again at that figure of less than 70,000 cases. What does that figure represent? Using the figures of the Federal Department of Agriculture, we find that 70,000 cases of eggs represents only four days' production.

Four days' production, improperly handled, can

devastate the income of the egg producer.

Now let us ask the question, "What would have happened without the government support plan?"

The producer would have continued to receive 24 cents instead of 32 cents and would have liquidated his flocks, at any price. There is no question about that.

This would have been followed by a shortage of eggs and consequently up would go the prices. And now both the producers and consumers, can rightfully demand what is the answer to all this?

The answer is for egg producers to step forward and organize under the legislation passed by this government.

Under the "Toll on Containers Act" a levy could be made on egg cartons or egg cases to obtain funds. These funds could be used to engage a practical, experienced man to make a thorough study of the entire industry.

The producer, the egg station operator, the commission broker, the chain store operator and the consumer could all be taken into full consideration and from that point on, the proper solutions would be found and a sound marketing system could be introduced to make those findings effective.

And now, Mr. Speaker, since I have pointed out the urgent need for a marketing scheme for egg producers to organize under our marketing legislation, I would like to say a few words about a marketing scheme which has changed all the old methods of marketing.

In 1935, 51 growers in the Harrow area organized a co-operative pool to grade and market their early potatoes. During that first year of operation, 22,548 bags were marketed and sold for the amount of $17,704. Last year,

1949, in that same small area, around the town of Harrow, 138 growers produced a total of 228,842 bags which brought an average price of $1.61 per bag.

In 1946, this same organization had their highest year in dollar sales and sold potatoes in the amount of $436,405.

Along with similar co-operative organizations in the towns of Kingsville, Leamington and Blenheim, the potato growers organized themselves as a potato marketing group, and applied for a scheme under our farm marketing legislation.

All dealers and growers are now licensed. We know where everybody stands in the industry.

The Quota and Acreage Committee met in January and suggested to the membership that a voluntary reduction in acreage was advisable this year, in view of the heavy current stocks of potatoes.

If it becomes necessary in future years, acreage reduction can be imposed, but this year it was only advised.

When the crop is ready to market, a Committee will meet and strike an initial price, based on the current price of old potatoes, and the estimated yield of the new crop.

Every week during the marketing season, this Committee will meet and change the price, based on the visible supply and actual demand.

Digging quotas will be assigned to the growers to keep an even flow going to the markets, and the prices will be stabilized for short, but definite periods.

Uniform and closely supervised grading, along with

quick movement to markets, will ensure the consumer of the highest possible quality.

We know this is quite different to the potato market. We know this is quite different to the potato market of the old days when everybody could buy potatoes at any price. We know that if there came a rainy season for three or four days and the farmer could not get on his land, the price of potatoes would go up and of course, it would be the holder of these potatoes who would make the most. Now it is being put on a uniform and orderly basis and I am sure it will turn out to the best advantage of everyone in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, this type of marketing is a direct result of the progressive policy of this government.

I wish to conclude my remarks with some reference to policy.

For some reason I have not had the usual interruptions this year while I have been making this speech but no doubt, before I get through --

MR. E. PARK (Dovercourt): It is the same speech, that is why.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MURDOCH: In the progressive legislation which we bring forward in this legislature, we receive a tremendous barrage of criticism from the opposition. We have lengthy speeches, but in the end we usually have a lukewarm, and half-hearted acquiescence.

The result is always the same. The opposition agrees that our measures are very commendable as far as they go, but they do not go far enough, or they do not go fast enough.

Let us look around the world and see what has

happened in any country where a little Socialism has been tried by the Socialists.

Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain have all turned back to democratic free enterprise.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): No, Conservatives gone Socialist.

MR. MURDOCH: And the countries which did not go back, have been taken over by the Communists.

It could be said, that the Socialists who do not repent become the unwitting advance agents of the Communists.

MR. PARK: Not nearly so much as the Tories.

MR. MURDOCH: I thought I would have a little remark on that.

I wish to close my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by quoting from the book, "Conservatism Revisited", by Peter Viereck.

MR. PARK: What about the 22 points?

MR. MURDOCH: The book is by Peter Viereck.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Who is he?

MR. PARK: He was interned during the war, was he not?

MR. MURDOCH: No, no. His expressions there are:

> "Conservative principles are proportion and measure.
> Self-expression through self-restraint.
> Preservation through reform.
> Humanism and balance.
> These create freedom. A freedom built, not on the quicksand of adolescent defiance, but on the bedrock of ethics and law."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make some small contribution to the Debate on the Speech from the Throne, I would like first of all to extend my congratulations to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) upon his elevation to the highest office in the province of any elected representative. It has often been said that power thrust into new hands usually goes to one's head, but I do not think that such will be case so far as the present hon. leader of the government (Mr. Frost) is concerned.

I would also like to congratulate the two new hon. members who have been added to the provincial council since we last met. I wish them every success in the responsibilities which they have assumed.

Then, a word of congratulation to the mover and seconder of the motion adopting the Speech from the Throne. I listened with a great deal of interest to what both of these hon. members had to say. I am sure they will have a very interesting and profitable time as hon. members of this Legislature. While not having had an opportunity of meeting either one of these men before, I do feel, particularly if all reports be true, that I did have a small part to play in the election of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds). Be that as it may, I did enjoy two very pleasant days in Gananoque and in Brockville. While there, I found the Conservatives to be ultra-conservative and I found the Liberals -- what few there were of them -- to be ultra-liberal. I find that as a result of the election there are just as many Liberal prevaricators in Leeds as in any other riding in the province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BROWN: If I should by any chance, which I do not intend to do, but if by chance I should be moving from Waterloo, I should like to take up abode along the St. Lawrence River, even though politically I would be a voice crying in the wilderness.

There is just one more bouquet I would like to pass on, and that is to the government for the appointment of the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote) to the position of Deputy Chief Commissioner of the Liquor Control Board. While we in our group frown upon the appointment of elected representatives to positions of this kind, nevertheless, I feel that this is an excellent appointment. It is quite possible that he may have talked himself into this position, I do not know, but be that as it may, I think he is doing an excellent job, and it is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that this great subject of liquor control circumvents the boundary of party politics, and as such, I feel he is deserving of the co-operation of every hon. member in this House as he undertakes a most difficult task.

Now, I might just as well complete the credit side of the ledger while I am at it, and say I would be less than fair were I not to commend the government upon its items which are or were contained in the Speech from the Throne. I think we are all particularly impressed with the legislation which has already been enacted, especially with respect to housing, and with respect to incorporation of a company to acquire debentures of some of the weaker municipalities. I think I am voicing the opinion of all hon. members of the House when I say we are particularly

impressed with the co-operation which now seems to exist between the federal and provincial governments.

I do not fall in line with the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison), who states that the government is getting too friendly with Ottawa. I do not think that such a thing can be possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to deal with matters relating to my own riding save to say this, that the people of North Waterloo still have retained their good, sound political judgment as was exemplified in the election last June when the Liberal candidate was elected by a majority running into five figures. I might also say that since we last assembled here, we have had a visit from the entire membership of one of the parties in this House. They were both up to Kitchener. They were there in response to an advertisement which appeared in the Kitchener "Record", calling for mass meetings, and I think I am properly informed that when the meetings assembled together, a total of about 35 persons were there. Many of these were of the curious type, and I think I can quite definitely assure these hon. members that the City of Kitchener or the city of North Waterloo is not a very profitable field for their form of propaganda.

MR. MacLEOD: There were only 12 Disciples.

MR. BROWN: That is more than I thought there would be there.

MR. SALSBERG: He does not "get" it.

MR. BROWN: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is just one other matter I would like to bring to the attention of this House, having to do with a statement that was made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), when he made an

address a few days ago. It has to do with the reduced devidend which is being paid by the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. I want the hon. members of this House to distinctly understand that I am not interested in the Bell Telephone Company directly or indirectly. I am not interested in the application which is being made to the Department of Transport, --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, you should be.

MR. BROWN: -- for an increase in their rates, exce pt in as much as it will affect my pocketbook the same as any other, should the application be not accep ted. I just wanted to correct an impression, and I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) would like me to do it, in that the rate of dividend is not eight per cent. Eight per cent is the rate on $25. of par value of the stock, but I think if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) were to study the financial statement of the company, he would see that the company has received from the public an additional thirty-three and one half million dollars. The rate is 6.6, not eight per cent.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that correction. I have examined the books, the financial statement of the company, and the company stands convicted out of the mouth of its own president.

MR. BROWN: I still say it is not correct. The financial figures are available. The par value of the total issued capital was $158,500,000. fully paid up shares. That represented 6,339,390 shares. In addition to that, the investors in the Bell Telephone Company paid in thirty-three and one half million dollars by way of premiums, making a total of $191,800,000. odd.

(Take I-1 follows)

It is on that basis you must divide your six million, and not into 158,000.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are all wrong.

MR. BROWN: I stand to be corrected, but I challenge any statement the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) makes with respect to the information I have here.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Are there any split shares there?

MR. BROWN: No, there are no split shares whatsoever.

MR. SALSBERG: Any watered stock?

MR. BROWN: No watered stock whatsoever, and I still say I am not standing here in defence of the Bell Telephone Co., but merely in defence of 167,000 shareholders of the company who are wondering why it is that if the company is paying 8%, they are not receiving 8% ontheir investment.

MR. SALSBERG: Among whomare many widows and orphans.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BROWN: It is true a great many of them are receiving less than 5% on their actual capital stock investment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What about the original investment?

MR. BROWN: The original investment, there has been no money paid into the Bell Telephone Company at any time at less than $25 per share, and the average rate that has been paid in by the shareholders of the Bell Telephone Company from 1880, when it was first formed, is $30.26.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): And many of them are employees.

MR. BROWN: And many of them are the employees of the company. In 1946 and 1947 the stock was issued by the Bell Telephone Company for $36.00---part of it---and the balance for $35.00, all of which went into the treasury of the company. I would just like to ask the hon. leader of the opposition

(Mr. Jolliffe) to look into those figures and see if I am not correct.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The leader of the opposition has looked into all those figures and is not taken in by any Bell Telephone Company propaganda in this House or anywhere else.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: I shall leave the issue stand, and I think sometime if he will look into it, he will see that my figures are correct. I am quite confident he will, as a matter of fact.

AN hon. MEMBER: Do not be too sure.

MR. BROWN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to spend a little time dealing with a few observations I have formed since last we assembled here as a Legislature. First of all, it does seem to me that some change should be made in the administrative control and in the administration of the Community Centres Act. Inso doing, I have every respect for the purpose behind this Act and for the purpose in making available to the farming communities or for the rural communities grants in the amount of $5000 or $10,000, as the case might be. However, it does seem to me that, with all due respect to the farmers and the farming community, there is just as much necessity for grants being made to the larger urban municipalities as to the smaller ones, and I am quite confident that all hon. members of this House will realize that these small grants of $5000 and $10,000 are wholly inadequate to meet the needs of the larger municipalities. In the city of Kitchener we are erecting an auditorium which is going to cost the people of that city, not $65,000 or $100,000, but a million dollars. And that is the type of auditorium which is required for the needs of that community.

You can quite imagine that $5000 or $10,000 of a grant for that purpose is wholly inadequate.

My recommendation is this, that the administration be taken out of the hands of the Department of Agriculture and placed, probably, under the direction of the Department of Muhicipal Affairs, that the $5000 and $10,000 grant be considered as basic grants, supplemented by one dollar per capita for all of the individuals who are feeding into this project, provided of course that the total grants shall only embrace those living within the boundaries of the municipality receiving it.

It also seems to me that the control is just a little drastic. It seems to me like the tail wagging the dog. The government being the tail. They contribute $5000 or $10,000, as the case might be, the municipalities contribute 10, 20 or even 100 times or 1000 times as much, and yet they have the full control as to the administration of the affairs of this project for a period of twenty years. I venture to say there are quite a number of municipalities who would otherwise qualify but have not placed applications for these funds, simply because they do not wish to be tied down so drastically.

It does seem to me thatif a municipality has approved of a project of this nature that a period of five or ten years would be sufficient in order that the provicial government might see that the project is being properly administered.

I should like to see adopted by the province of Ontario or at least legislation enacted by the province of Ontario for the formation of a provincial board of police commissioners. Under the Audit Act of the province of Ontario they, in their wisdom, have made it practical now for the policing of municipalities to be taken completely out of politics, by the

appointment of a Board of Police Commissioners, usually consisting of the judge and the mayor and the magistrate of the municipality. However, it is in my opinion another case of doing as we say and not as we do, and the policing of the province of Ontario still remains under the direction of an elected representative of the province of Ontario.

I placed a question on the Order Paper of this hon. Legislature, asking for the cost of the inquiry into the alleged complaints made by one Ernest Keays of the city of Belleville.

(Page I-5 follows)

This House received an answer that the cost was $12,405., but to me that was a very small part of the cost. What is far more devastating to me is the humility and the ambarrassment and the heartache suffered by a great many people of more or less degrees of innocence for dragging their names through the public press, and it seems to me as though this could be one of the duties of a provincial board of Police commissioners.

Another duty would be, of course, to receive and to screen and to submit for examination those persons who are making application to join the Provincial Police Force, thus taking them entirely beyond the pale of party patronage. To me, patronage is an insidious thing, it usually results in maladroit administration, but in my opinion, the one group of individuals who should not be sponsored by any political party are those who are making application for the Provincial Police Force.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: And I regret to see that such is not my feeling at the present time. I feel that a board of Provincial Police Commissioners would have unlimited scope. We have a Milk Control Board, we have a Liquor Control Board, we have a Municipal Board, and we have countless other boards, and yet I know of no Boardwhich would be able to do the same job, or as good a job as a board of Police Police Commissioners.

I would like just to say a word about welfare, at least about old-age pensions, and in so doing I hasten to say -- and I think I am expressing the feeling of all hon. members of this House -- we are getting excellent

co-operation from the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). Nothing seems to be too great a task for him to undertake, and he seems to do it all with a smile.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: There are just one or two problems which I would like to present to him. The one has to do with the person who refuse to make application for a pension because he or she feels that at the time of his or her death the entire estate will revert back tothe Crown, whether it be provincial or Dominion. There are a great many people like that, and while I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) has done everything in his pwoer, I believe, to alleviate this through the tests, it still is not getting home to these applicants. I have a suggestion to make and it is this, that rather than notify the newspapers through press releases, he contact the clerksof all the municipalities of the province of Ontario in order that this matter might come before the various councils of the municipalities where the press is invariably represented, and it seems to me that in thatway these people can become educated. It is so unfortunate that there are so many people who are eligible for old age pensions in the province of Ontario who are not receiving them, simply because they are afraid.

Secondly, it does seem to me that the maximum earnings of $1080 for a married couple inthe twilight years of their lives, when the costs for medical sorvices, hospitalization, etc., become so great, is wholly inadequate to meet their needs. The $1080 does include whatever pension is available to them.

I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow), were he in the House, would say that this is a Federal matter, that it is the Department of Welfare at Ottawa that determines how much shall be paid, but I would like him to understand that in Ottawa we have a very sympathetic government and I am quite convinced that a note from him to the hon. Mr. Martin, the Minister of Welfare in Ottawa, would receive a very sympathetic hearing indeed.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Set up another committee, you mean.

MR. BROWN: Could be that.

(Page I-8 follows)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why it is, but towards the end of last Session of this House, we heard many words spoken, Hansard, I am sure, enlarged its space by a third in dealing with a certain bill about which we have heard absolutely nothing since we have assembled.

MR. MacLEOD: Here is your chance,

MR. BROWN: It does seem to me there was an excellent opportunity to have some reference, contained in the Speech from the Throne suggesting that the Charitable Gifts Bill be amended. I was looking for it but I did not find it.

MR. G.H.DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): I thought you said you were down to Leeds?

MR. BROWN: Pardon?

MR. DOUCETT: I thought you told us you were down to Leeds?

MR. BROWN: Oh, I was down there, I will come to that in just a minute. I am very glad you brought that up.

Since we met here, I took every occasion I possibly could to discuss this bill with members of the legal profession, and on no occasion did I find anyone who did not have the same opinion as have I, that it is basically a good piece of legislation---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: At the same time, I did not meet one single member of the Bar, whether he be Liberal, Conservative or C.C.F., who felt that the retroactive portion of that Bill was good, sound jurisprudence.

HON. D.N.A PORTER (Attorney-General): The Bill was not retroactive.

MR. BROWN: Oh, yes it was.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: Here we go again.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Are you going to start that again?

MR. BROWN: Are you going to bring that up again?

MR. PORTER: I do not know, You are bringing it up.

MR. BROWN: I certainly am, and it is definitely retroactive so far as I am concerned. Now then, we talk about Leeds--

MR. PORTER: As one lawyer to another.

MR. BROWN: --and I would like to warn the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and hon. members of this government that he cannot accept the election verdict in Leeds as a vindication of government policy so far as this Bill is concerned. All you have to do is look upon the hon. member (Mr. Reynolds) himself and look upon his popularity: you will find out it was in spite of, not because of this Bill that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) was elected.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is an indication of govornment spending.

MR. BROWN: It could be. I do hope, though, speaking seriously---

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes.

MR. SALSBERG: Was that not serious?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BROWN: Not so serious as what I am going to say now. Speaking seriously, I hope the government will, before it is too late, see that the retroactive feature of this Bill is eliminated.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member (Mr. Brown) permit a question? Have you heard the rumour that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is going to bring in a Bill to put teeth in the Charitable Gift Act?

MR. BROWN: No, I have not heard any rumours of that.

MR. PORTER: I have never heard of any teeth, I have only heard about "gnashing of teeth!"

MR. BROWN: Now, Mr. Speaker just one or two more points.

One has to do with complaints which have beenpresented to this House from time to time with reppect to the terrific load of taxation which is being borne by the muhicipalities on such a narrow base. I wouldlike to read to you an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen just a few weeks ago, and one which I think is very apropos:

"Mayor Bourke in his message to city council opening the second year of his term put his finger on the real problem facing not only Ottawa but all Canadian citizens, how they are to meet their obligations and pay their bills under an antiquated tax system which imposes on real estate the great bulk of municipal costs. The Dominion Government is to pay Ottawa under a new arrangement about $500,000 a year, a sum the Mayor calls quite inadequate.

"We g t substantial grants from the Ontario government towards schools and some social services b t despite all this, rising costs in all directions and expenditures which cannot be avoided in an expanding community are forcing the tax rates skywards, tothe extreme discomfort of property owners. Beyond all this we face the cost development of suburban areas incorporated with Ottawa, laregly to simplify capital plans of Federal authorities.

"All this is an old story, perhaps, but one way or another, there must come an end to these annual boosts in the tax rates before home owners revolt, and they can stand only so much. Basically, the fault is in the tax system itself and in the dis-

tribution of responsibility for public works and services. The whole thing needs readjustment, and drastically."

(Page I-12 follows)

It does seem to me, with all the brain power that exists in government circles, from the ministers down --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where?

MR. BROWN: Or should I say, the ministers across -- there should certainly be sufficient brain power to come up with a solution to this problem. I listened with a great deal of interest to the address which was delivered this afternoon by the hon. the member for North Grey (Mr. Phillips) in which he dealt at length with the costs of hospitalization, in his community. I believe it is tonight that the tax rate will be set for the city of Kitchener. There will be a two-and-a half mill rate advantage, increased assessments, and yet I am quite confident that the mill rate, when it is announced tomorrow, will be up three mills.

MR. SALSBERG: Now, Now, no leading.

MR. BROWN: And the major portion of that increase will be due largely to increased costs of hospitalization. The per diem cost of hospitals in Kitchener, although the gross cost is $9.45 if you exclude pharmacy, radiology, pathology, physical therapy, and medical and surgical services, you reduce that $9.45 to $7.44. Even on the basis of the minimum cost of $7.44 the hospital in Kitchener is losing $1.69 on every ward patient other than private and semi-private wards, and $2.69 on every indigent patient who passes through that hospital.

Unfortunately -- and Kitchener is in no different position from any other hospital in any other community -- a fairly large percentage of patients come from outside of the community. Out of a total of 15,900 indigent patients, 43.5 per cent come from outside the city of Kitchener , and the city of Waterloo for a total direct loss, to our community,

a loss which must be borne by the ratepayers of our municipality, of $18,500. Similarly with regard to ward patients, out of a total of 23,400 patient days, 8,900 -- 9,000 almost -- come from the county and other places outside the municipalities of Kitchener and Waterloo, a total of 38 per cent; at $1.69, this was also a further loss of $15,165., or a total loss of $33,665 that the city of Kitchener and the city of Waterloo must pay in order to hospitalize those people who come from the surrounding districts.

(Take G follows)

Now, it seems to me that these are problems which the provincial government, in conjunction with the Federal government, should cope with, because it does not seem right or fair that the municipality, collecting all these taxes by the real estate method of assessment, should have to assume, in addition, this large sum of money.

That just refers to hospitalization. There are all the other social services, and also education, which I think is part of the answer to it as well.

Just one more word, before I sit down. I read with a great deal of interest and encouragement in the Speech from the Throne, at the 1949 Session, this reference, which is contained on page 6 of Hansard. It says that the government shall do thus and so -- that is part of it, and then it says:

> "Progressive and sympathetic law enforcement with particular firmness in the suppression of subversive elements, so as to guarantee the rights of the people to go about their lawful business".

I was very much surprised indeed, in listening to the Speech From the Throne this year, that I heard no such reference there.

Would it be possible that the government of the day does not see the necessity of such watchfulness, of such vigilance? Would it be possible that, as a result of the last Federal election, when the Communistic candidate in the city of Toronto received such a crushing blow, that this government feels it is not necessary to carry on its watchful attitude toward this enemy of democracy?

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): We are just as watchful as before.

MR. BROWN: Not from what I see here.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Would you like a Padlock Act in Ontario?

MR. BROWN: I would like to say this, that it is because of the carelessness and lack of watchfulness on the part of the individual, and on the part of the people of this province, that these seeds such as I have mentioned, have been allowed to spread.

I quite appreciate that subversity is something which we have had with us for many, many centuries. It was at least one hundred years ago that Longfellow wrote these words:

"There is a poor blind Sampson in this land,
Shorn of his strength and bound in bands of steel,
Who may in some grim revel raise his head
And shake the pillars of this common weal
'Til the vast temples of our liberties
A shapeless mass of wreck and rubbish lies.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): That is what they said about William Lyon Mackenzie.

MR. BROWN: That was written about one hundred years ago, but it might just as well have been written yesterday.

MR. SALSBERG: You would have raised the --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWN: With this world becoming smaller and smaller, I think it is certainly in the best interests of this province, to have the hon. members of this government see to it that they make the province of Ontario, and the Dominion of Canada, so strong and such an interesting place in which to live, that the seeds of subversity will not be permitted to grow.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WM. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, and with the permission of the House, I would like to

move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Porter, that on tomorrow, Wednesday, the fifteenth instant, and also on Thursday, the sixteenth instant, this House will meet at two of the clock in the afternoon, and that the provision of rule two of the Assembly be suspended so far as it might apply to this motion.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on this motion, may I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) leading the government, whether there is any significance in the omission of Friday, St. Patrick's Day?

MR. DOUCETT: It is covered in a blanket motion made the other day.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I thought it was moved on Thursday.

MR. DOUCETT: That was done some time ago, Mr. Speaker, and referred to every Friday.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.57 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - -

Volume 20.

P R O C E E D I N G S ,

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS FIFTEENTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK P. M.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 15, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

THE PHARMACY ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough), that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Pharmacy Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) explain that Bill, please.

MR. GOODFELLOW: It is to provide for a four-year course in the profession.

MR. MILLARD: Instead of two?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes.

THE DRUGLESS PRACTITIONERS ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough) that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Drugless Practitioners Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) tell us, on the previous Bill to amend the Pharmacy Act, is that going to apply to those who are already registered?

MR. GOODFELLOW: In reply to the hon. member (Mr. Millard) I will tell him that it applies to those who will be

coming into the course, after those who are now in have graduated.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Salsberg, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Houck, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): May I ask the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) to explain the Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: May I say to the hon. members, that this is a Bill which I am sure the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) would have introduced himself, except that he has been carrying a very heavy load, and did not get around to it.

In this amendment, the holder of a license or permit, under the Act shall not, in the conduct of his business pursuant to such license or permit, be discriminated against, -- there shall be no discrimination against any person or class of persons, because of their race, creed or colour.

It is to efface the crime of Dresden, and make sure there is no recurrence.

THE VENEREAL DISEASES PREVENTION ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough) that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Venereal Disease Prevention Act, 1942", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) please explain that Act?

MR. GOODFELLOW: There is no change whatever. The amendment will clarify the Act. Certain parties have, perhaps, been working under authority that does not exist under the present Act.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the annual report of the Department of the Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1949, with respect to the administration of the Companies Act, and the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act;

(2) The annual report of the Department of the Provincial Secretary for the calendar year ended December 31st, 1949, with respect to the administration of the Extra Provincial Corporations Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the answer to question number 59.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to mention that I saw the former hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) yesterday, and he asked me to convey to the House his good wishes, and I want to say that he knows more of what is going on in the House than any one here. On his desk in front of him he has a copy of the routine orders and petitions and proceedings, and all the Bills, and a complete Hansard, and seems to know more than the government feels that it knows itself, at least more than I know, myself.

He did want me to say how he misses being here, and I know he meant it very kindly. He is sitting up this week, for an hour or so, and next week he hopes to walk a little, and perhaps the next week, he will be able to get out of the hospital.

I do not know if you have noticed the two packets of cheese that have been put on everyone's desk. That is something that the cheese producers of Ontario got up. They have a great interest in the cheese industry, and I want to recommend this cheese. I wish to say this; without any doubt, there is no better cheese the world over, than that cheese you have on your desks. Whether you buy cheese at a dollar a pound or two dollars a pound, the cheese you have on your desks is the best that you can get anywhere.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

CANADA CONFERENCE EVANGELICAL CHURCH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting Canada Conference Evangelical Church", Mr. Houck.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting Canada Conference Evangelical Church".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children", Mr. Rea.

MR. CHARLES E. REA (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE CITY OF GUELPH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act respecting the City of Guelph", Mr. Edwards.

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Edwards, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act respecting the City of Guelph".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6

PROVINCIAL YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec", Mr. Blackwell.

MR. CHARLES E. REA (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE STATUTE LABOUR ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, third reading of Bill No. 91,"An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act", Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 91, "An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, third reading of Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10

THE EXTRA PROVINCIAL CORPORATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, third reading of Bill No. 96, " An Act to amend the Extra Provincial Corporations Act", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend the Extra Provincial Corporations Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, third reading of Bill No. 98, "An Act to amend the Companies Act", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 98, "An Act to amend the Companies Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, third reading of Bill No. 99, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act", Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 99, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

THE TEACHERS SUPERANNUATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, third reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend the Teachers Superannuation Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend the Teachers Superannuation Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 14.

THE ATHLETICS CONTROL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourteenth Order, third reading of Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Athletics Control Act, 1947" Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Athletics Control Act".

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the third reading of this Bill, and I think it should receive some consideration by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) because it has raised a great deal of comment and apprehension in some organizations. Some organizations may suffer from such a Bill being brought in later. I want to clarify my stand. It was not so much a matter of reaching the tax evaders, but exercising the responsibility, as a member of the Legislature, to guide the moral part of athletics. When money comes into sport, it is my contention that the sportsmanship goes out. I think now there is a rule in hockey leagues that prohibits fraternization. That is contrary to all conception of British sportsmanship, and should not be encouraged.

We do not want sports that in the past were amateur, deteriorated. Football is the most pronounced example. We even have the salaries of players published in the newspapers, and these people compete in other fields of entertainment with people who pay the tax, and when a sport degenerates

to that, it is at the expense of Canadians who endeavour to play the sport for pleasure. If, at a later date, a Bill is brought in and the tax monies are received in these conditions it will be a step to restore these games to the people who play for pleasure.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 15

THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifteenth Order, third reading of Bill No. 100, "The Provincial Parks Act", Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 100, "The Provincial Parks Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

TOWNSHIP OF CORNWALL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No.18, "An Act respecting the Township of Cornwall", Mr. McDonald.

MR. J. L. McDONALD (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Township of Cornwall".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and

be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 37.

CITY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto", Mr. Rea.

MR. CHALRES E. REA (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the city of Toronto".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 38.

SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-eighth Order, second reading of Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa," Mr. Morrow.

MR. D. H. MORROW (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 39.

KNOX COLLEGE LIBRARY AND CERTAIN ARCHIVES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-ninth Order, second reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Knox College Library and Certain Archives", Mr. Mackenzie.

MR. A. MACKENZIE (York North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Knox College Library and Certain Archives".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 40.

THE TOWN OF RIVERSIDE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fortieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act respecting the Town of Riverside", Mr. Murdoch.

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act respecting the Town of Riverside".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 48.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-eighth Order, second reading of Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act".

Most of the sections in this Act are to clarify the details of organization of a township school area -- particularly where such an area includes more than one municipality. Adjustments arising out of the formation of township school boards will henceforth be made by the Minister, and a referee appointed by him instead of by the Ontario Municipal Board, and a referee appointed by it.

The Bill also gives to school boards the power to provide life insurance for employees and accident insurance in respect of injuries to pupils.

The Bill also gives authority to boards to establish systems of sick-leave credits and pensions for non-teaching employees.

(Take B follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 41.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-first Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, Mr. Frost.

MR. WM. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, before coming into the House this afternoon, I along with some other hon. members of this Legislature, was waited upon by a delegation of the unemployed from the city of Toronto, who were seeking an interview with the government of the province, and also the hon. members of this Legislature.

I would like to point out that unemployment is rapidly becoming a serious problem in the city of Toronto. Every night, in the Fred Victor Mission, and in the St. Lawrence Market, we find the unemployed taking up every available inch of room to sleep on bare floors, without even a blanket or covering of any kind . At six o'clock in the morning these men are turned out into the streets again. I believe they are able to get a bowl of soup at the Fred Victor Mission, and a slice of bread. They line up at the Scott Mission on Spadina Avenue in Toronto, and are able to get a bowl of soup there, and a slice of bread, and they spend the rest of the day wandering around the city looking for work, or for some means of sustenance, and once again they gather in the evening at the Fred Victor Mission or the St. Lawrence Market, or such charitable organizations as are assuming the job which should be done by this government.

I would like to urge the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the government to consider undertaking immediately, public

works which will provide work for thesemen who are at the present time unemployed.

Many of these young men to whom I have talked are men who have in some cases only recently been discharged from the armed forces. They served overseas. A few years ago they were heros; today they are walking the streets of this province without jobs, and without means of subsistence. I do not think it is sufficient for the government to state that this responsibility is a Federal responsibility. The failure of Ottawa to assume their obligations is no excuse for the province of Ontario not assuming its responsibilities in this particular connection.

It may be that at the present time it is not practical to undertake public works which would absorb the unemployed, in which case I would urge the government to consider some form of cash relief, in order that these men may live, and that they may, at least, be "getting by" in a little more comfortable position than they are at the present time.

I want to say that I do not believe that cash relief is any solution to the problem. The moral disintegration of men who are unemployed and have to receive cash relief, is a pitiful thing, and is something I think we should stay away from. I would urge that every effort be made to provide public works in order to take up the slack in unemployment at the present time.

I want to say that I believe that unemployment is going to increase. I think it is a product of the capitalistic system under which we are existing at the present time, and we are heading once more toward a period similar to that which we witnessed in the 30's throughout Canada. I very much regret he government has not un ertaken any action, or has not the

plans to prevent such a condition re-occurring. I am afraid we are going to return to the disastrous conditions which we had in the 30's.

That is all I want to say with regard to unemployment. There is a great deal more that perhaps should be said, but other speakers have dealt with the subject, and I am quite sure the government is well aware of the fact, and I hope that they would try to do something to alleviate the conditions which exist.

I want to say a few brief words about housing. If there is any field in which private enterprise has proved a complete failure, it is in the housing field. The people of Canada are without decent homes today, in large numbers. I imagine that every hon. member representing a riding of the city of Toronto has calls every week from people who are either facing eviction, or people who, for some reason, have not a place to live, and are being crowded in with others, and living in very crowded, almost slum conditions.

This is a case where the government should step in and assume the task which private enterprise has been unable to carry out. It does require a certain degree of courage, and a degree of vision and enterprise, which I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, this government has not been shown to possess at the present time.

There is nothing they have done which will relieve the terrific shortage of houses which exists on all sides.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is not private enterprise.

MR. TEMPLE: I see the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) is smiling --

MR. FROST: I know my hon. friend (Mr. Temple) really

does not mean all of that.

MR. TEMPLE: I would hate to tell the government what I really do mean. I am afraid I would be ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker.

I would urge the government again to give consideration to a low-rental public housing project. It would relieve the unemployment situation, and at the same time provide homes for our people, which they are certainly not going to get unless the government has occasion to build houses. I believe a project such as this would be self-liquidating. The houses could be built and sold to people on a rental-purchase basis, and the project would pay for itself.

There is one other little item I wanted to discuss. During last Session, and again this Session, I have been trying to analyze the procedure in the work of the Legislature, and it does seem to me that we spend a great deal of time here on innocuous, unimportant Bills. We have been in Session now for four weeks. We have something like one hundred Bills, to give first, and second reading, third reading, and to pass, and I think fully one half of those one hundred Bills are Bills which could be handled by governmental departments, and could relieve this Legislature of the necessity of going through the procedure of passing them three times.

I am thinking at the moment of the Y.M.C.A. Bill which we passed this afternoon, giving the Y.M.C.A. the power to change its name. Surely this is something which the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter) Department could handle for a fee of five dollars, or some nominal sum, and if the Y.M.C.A. wants to change its name, why do we have to

bring in a Bill before this Legislature?

There is a Bill from the City of Guelph, to give that city the power and right to have a memorial garden. I am sure it is a very fine project, but I do not see why we should be burdened with a Bill of this kind. The Municipal Board surely knows much more about the affairs of Guelph than we do, and if they think they should have a municipal garden, that also should be handled by the Municipal Board, and not be brought to the Legislature.

There is one Bill I want to mention, just as an example. That is a Bill from the town of Port Hope, asking for exemption from taxation for a local school. It seems to me the Legislature could lay down some broad principles, for this right to exemption of local schools, and if the local school in Port Hope, wanted to be exempt from taxation, they could be, and then it could be carried to cover exemptions for schools throughout the whole province, and legislation of that nature could be passed, and we should be relieved of the burden of having a special Bill to permit this town to exempt a local school.

At the last Session, we witnessed a large number of C.C.F. Bills, and those from other opposition groups, which were left on the Order Paper, and which we did not have an opportunity to discuss in this Assembly. I was sent here, along with the hon. members representing other Opposition groups, to put certain ideas and certain viewpoints in front of the hon. members of this Legislature, and perhaps through the newspapers, to the people of the province, and to my way of thinking, it is a denial of democracy to permit these Bills to go undiscussed. It looks very much at the

present time as if the situation will exist again at this Session. We have a large number of Bills which have not yet been brought forward. We are already "turning on the heat" to speed up the Legislature, and it looks very much as if these Bills will not be called, or else they will all be brought up in the last day or two of the Session, and slaughtered in a cold-blooded way, and nobody will have an adequate opportunity to discuss them.

I would like to suggest -- maybe this is the result of being a new member, and not being familiar with the situation -- but in order to make this Assembly more efficient, we should consider some method of handling these small, innocuous Bills, to relieve the Legislature of some of its time, and permit us to discuss the much more important things, which should be considered in this Assembly.

When I have said that, Mr.Speaker, I want to move on to something which I think almost every hon. member of this Legislature will be interested in, and certainly I know a large number of people outside the Legislature are interested in it, and that is the tremendous increase in the consumption of alcohol in the province.

I would like to go back to 1946, to a Bill which was introduced in that year in this Legislature, intituled, "The Liquor License Act, 1946".

By the passage of that Act, the government assumes a great deal of responsibility for conditions which exist throughout the province at the present time. I do not want to say that the great increase and the tragedies in connection with the liquor problem, are entirely the result of the

action of the present government, but I do say that a great deal of the situation and the problems which exist at the present time are due to actions of the government in letting down the bars for the passage of the Liquor License Act, 1946, and opening up the sale of liquor in the province of Ontario to an extent this province has never before witnessed. At the present time, in Ontario, we have the widest sale of alcohol of any province in Canada today.

In 1946, Mr. George Drew, who was then Prime Minister of Ontario, stated that the new Liquor License Act was designed to reduce the consumption of hard liquor, and that he believed it was a true temperance measure, and that in some mysterious way it was going to stop or help prevent bedroom drinking, which was going on in the hotels in the major cities of the province.

I just want to say this; if he really believed that, he was the most naive and innocent man who ever stood up in this Assembly. Certainly his friends outside the Legislature did not believe it, because Mr. E. P. Taylor, who was president of the Canadian Brewing Corporation, immediately announced, after the passing of that Act, that his company was going to double the capacity of the Canadian Brewing Corporation.

The stock market operators were certainly not of the opinion held by Mr. Drew, because in the first week after the passing of that Act, the stock market value of liquor stocks increased by more than $10,000,000.

I submit that the Liquor License Act of 1946 was, in reality, a Bill to permit the increased sale of alcohol for the benefit of those friends of the government who were in the liquor trade. The government was open-handed and a generous friend to the liquor interests, in permitting new

liquor sale laws of this province to go through the Legislature.

We have sown a crop, and for a few minutes I propose to try and show what kind of a crop the people of Ontario are harvesting.

In order that I might have up-to-date figures to present to the Legislature, I wrote to the Chief Commissioner of the Liquor Control Board, and asked him to give me the figures of the sale of spirits, beers and wines, for the calendar year 1948 and the calendar year 1949.

The letter was dated January 31st. On February 3rd, he replied, enclosing this statement for the fiscal year ended on March 31st, 1949.

I wrote to the Chief Commissioner, and thanked him for his statement, but pointed out that the figures were a year old, and I would like to present up-to-date figures to this Legislature, and asked him to submit figures for liquor sales in the province up to the end of December, 1949. I am very sorry to report that the Chief Liquor Commissioner did not think it necessary to reply to that letter. I think it is a tragic circumstance, that public business should be handled in such a manner. There is no reason why the people of Ontario should not receive monthly figures of sales, in order that they may know what is going on in the Liquor Control Department at the present time. I think it is public business, and we, as members of the Legislature, as well as the public, should have access to those figures.

However, I am going to use the figures which I have, and I think we will find them very, very illuminating.

In the year 1946 -- that was the year prior to the passage of the Liquor Control Act -- the total sales in Ontario were 55,849,000-odd gallons of alcohol. In the year ended March 31, 1949, the total sales were 79,099,000-odd gallons of alcohol. That was an increase, in the short time of four years, of 20,000,000 gallons of alcohol.

In terms of dollars sold in 1946, it amounted to $135,000,000., and some odd thousands; in 1949, the figure jumped from $135,000,000. to $187,000,000., an increase, again in four years, of $52,000,000. at the wholesale. If we were to add the profits of the beverage rooms and of the cocktail bars, to the figures I have just quoted, the people of Ontario would find that their liquor bill for the year ended March 31, 1949, was close to a quarter of a billion dollars.

The people of Ontario are spending at the rate of $250,000,000. annually.

Figures released by Ottawa show that in Ontario, in the year 1948, there was a greater increase in the consumption of liquor than in all the other provinces of Canada combined. This one province of Ontario showed a higher percentage of increase than the other nine provinces combined.

I think that is something which the government should consider very, very seriously, and I think that is due directly to the Liquor License Act, and the encouragement given for the sale of liquor by the government.

The Liquor License Act is responsible for the very great increase in the number of licenses throughout the Province.

In the four years under review, the number of licenses

increased by 343, for a grand total throughout the province of 4,251. If we deduct the military Messes, and licenses which were given to the military institutions in 1945, and which are not now in existance, we find that there are another 120 licenses, which have been issued to civilians, which would bring the total increase to 463 licenses, which have been issued in the past four years, or an average of about 125 additional licenses were issued annually under the present policy of the government.

Now, this works out to something like this; the people of Ontario are spending $60. per capita on liquor, and we are spending approximately $15. per capita on education.

Mr. Speaker, that is something which I think we should seriously do something about. The situation is certainly getting out of hand, when the people are only spending $15. on education per year, and seem to have no difficulty in spending $60. per capita on liquor.

I would like to give to the hon. members of the House, for a few minutes, a few facts in connection with the problem of alcohol.

In the Toronto Star of January 10th, of this year, there is an article quoting a speech by Chief Justice McRuer, delivered before the High Court of Ontario, and he says this:

> "Liquor and broken homes are the two great forces for crime in our community....."
>
> "Liquor is at the root of most of the cases of homicide coming before the courts, and in some large measure responsible for the too-frequent attacks on women and girls, and other serious crimes."

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very serious situation, when the Chief Justice of Ontario finds it necessary to call attention to the situation, in the manner he did.

I would like to refer the hon. members of the Legislature to a report in the Globe and Mail of January 19th, in which a report on the causes of juvenile delinquency was submitted to the Board of Control of the City of Toronto. This report states, among other things,--

> "Alcoholism was recognized as one of the prime factors leading to poor home conditions....
>
> "Poor home conditions are responsible in a great degree for the various situations existing with regard to juvenile delinquency."

Again, I would like to call the attention of the hon. members of the Legislature to a report issued by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) in which he stated that for the year 1949, there was a total of 18,000 people injured on the highways of Ontario during that year, and there were 800 people killed on the highways of Ontario in that year.

This is a situation which I think should be considered in the light of Professor Rogers' charges just a week ago, in which he stated that from 50 percent. to 60 percent. of all automobile accidents were due directly to liquor.

I see the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is looking up. I will be glad to read his speech.

Mr. Rogers taxes the magistrates for being unwilling to send respectable gentlemen to jail for driving while intoxicated, and charged the lawyers with the failure to face facts. He said, "only 50 percent. of the lawyers who go to

court want justice. The others want to win the case."

Then he goes on to say:

> "Regarding the deaths caused by drunken driving, that it is too amazing to be believed, and statistics show that 20 percent. of the major accidents were due to liquor,"

but he said the figures should be 50 percent. or 60 percent., if we could get all the facts.

This is borne out by the American Safety Council, which stated that in the United States 45 percent. of all accidents on the highways in that great Republic to the south of us, were caused by liquor.

Again, I have another item in the newspaper stating that the Chief of Police in the town of New Toronto said,

> "85 percent. of all automobile accidents on the Lakeshore Road are due to liquor."

I think these figures are significant, and should be taken into consideration.

Again I would draw to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- who is not in the House-- the newspaper headlines of just a week or ten days ago, with regard to his home town, in which a murder occurred on one of the main streets of Lindsay due to a drunken orgy in that town, and the statement made by the judge who sat on the case, that 20 out of 21 witnesses to the murder had been drinking, and their evidence was, therefore, unreliable.

Again I could draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) a similar incident in his hometown of Peterborough, in which Peterborough hit the headlines of the newspapers just a week ago,

in the trial of a man committed for murder as a result of a drunken party in a beverage room in Peterborough, which would up in another additional party in the home of the man charged with the murder.

I think we are witnessing in the press throughout the entire province, some of the crop we are harvesting as a result of this government's liquor sale policy.

Perhaps due to the rising feeling of the public in the province --

MR. DUNBAR: You cannot produce one from Ottawa? Read one from Ottawa.

MR. TEMPLE: No, I will say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that I think Ottawa is one of the cities which is not making the headlines in that regard. I wish they were all in that position.

I want to say, that perhaps because of the rising feeling throughout the province -- and there is a feeling with regard to this problem,-- the government is trying to take, in a very, very limited way, some measures to cope with it, and perhaps to appease some of their own members. I rather think that a majority of the hon. members on the government side of the House are rather sorry that the Liquor License Act of 1946 was ever passed. I think they would like to see -- along with almost all the hon. members on this side -- something done to curtail the ravages of the liquor trade at the present time.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), when he took over in May, perhaps as a result of this feeling, and a desire to do something, announced a new policy on the part of the government. They replaced the Registrar

of the Liquor License Board, and announced they would hire -- and I think they did hire -- a large number of new liquor license inspectors. I think there was a total of 17 additional men hired to go out in the province and inspect liquor selling premises, in an attempt to try and control the situation.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said they would try to get to the top; they were going to stop selling liquor to minors, and try to stop the sale of liquor in beverage rooms and cocktail bars to men who were drunk. That is a violation of the Liquor Act, and certainly it should be stopped.

I am in thorough accord with that policy, and I believe the only way to handle the liquor trade is to "get tough" with it. It contains the most lawless element in our society; they have a record of disregarding the law to a degree that no other business holds, and I would welcome anything that smacked of "getting tough."

In this connection, the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board also announced, in a statement to the press, that in future the government was not going to suspend licenses of liquor selling outlets, but he said they were going to cancel the licenses, and again, I am in hearty accord with that policy. I was very glad to hear him make that statement, and I thought I would investigate to see if they were carrying out the policy of cancelling the licenses, and just what they were doing in the liquor trade, many of them good friends of the government, and I was interested in finding out exactly what they had done in this regard.

(Take C-1 follows)

These are the facts. I am sure most of the hon. members of the House will be amazed, especially in view of the headlines of the policy of the government. In 1948 there was one cancellation of a liquor license. The new policy went into effect in 1942, and with that I thought I would find a tremendous increase in the "get tough" policy in evidence. In 1949, the total cancellations were two -- that is one hundred per cent increased, of course -- but nevertheless, we find only two licenses that the government saw fit to cancel. I am sure that if the hon. members would, on any Friday or Saturday night, go down Jarvis Street and around downtown Toronto, they would find ample evidence upon which to cancel the licenses of liquor-selling establishments. I do not think we are very far on the way to clearing up the liquor-selling outlets.

One of the other things that the government did, and again I approve of it, is to appoint as Deputy Chairman, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote). He enjoys the respect and confidence of every hon. member of the House, and he enjoy the respect and confidence of the public outside of the House. I want to say to him, however, sincerely, as a friend, that he is not going to permit the liquor trade to go unrestrained, and that he will use his clerical collar and his great war reputation to curb that most evil scheme in our midst.

I believe the people of Ontario, and the people in his own Party, look to him for leadership in solving this problem, and I want to say that he will require all the courage which he displayed overseas, to curb it and handle it.

I am sure every hon. member on this side of the House will co-operate with him in any measures he sees fit to introduce, to stop this tremendous increase in alcohol which is now taking place. The government has appointed a reserve

director; that is a good thing, but it does not begin to cope with the problem of this day. There are many things which should and could be done immediately, one is the early closing of beverage rooms.

Perhaps the chief commissioner of the Liquor Board had this in mind when he made a speech in Dundas, and stated that the government intended to give to the municipalities the right to decide when liquor outlets would be closed, and have some control over the number of licenses. However, the next morning, in another statement to the press, the chief commissioner stated that he was talking in generalities. Apparently, he did not mean what he said before.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): At no time did I make that statement. I said it was under consideration, and that is all I said.

MR. TEMPLE: I accept the statement of the Control Board. Apparently it was under consideration, and I hope they will eventually consider earlier closing. That is one of the logical steps to solve the problem.

The second is the reduction in the number of licenses. Certainly there is no excuse for Yonge Street being overloaded with licenses. In one block alone there are four or five retailers. That is unnecessary, and something should be done to stop the increasing number of outlets that are cropping up.

A third stage is an educational program which should be undertaken immediately. The Toronto board of education passed a motion and appointed a delegation to wait on the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to ask him to undertake the problem of temperance education throughout the schools of the province. The delegation from the Toronto board of education waited on the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) but I am

informed they had a cool and cold reception. Certainly nothing has been done by the government to date, and certainly something should be done. There are many films of a scientific nature which could be used and shown in our schools, and I think it should be done.

Another point, and this is the last one, and I will close. I think something should be done about liquor advertising. Newspapers in Toronto have pages and pages every night advertising cocktail bars and taverns which are getting to be big business dance halls, and floor shows, and television, and other attractions to attract the young people, and this advertising is very influential. I think that is contrary to the spirit intended by the government, and I think something should be done with regard to the advertising, and that it should be stopped. I want to say this, in closing. Social service agencies refer to homes and characters which have been shattered, and the government will be held responsible for the conditions that exist, and in my opinion they wi l be judged by the people of this province, by the measures and steps which they will take to control and alleviate a great deal of suffering and tragedy that stands at the present time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(PageC-4 follows)

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (Addington): Mr. Speaker, may I extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address presented to this House by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

I have had the pleasure of the acquaintance of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) over an extended period. I am very glad to welcome him to our ranks, and to congratulate him not only on his excellent address of a few days ago, but also on his outstanding victory in the by-election of last October. I am sure that he will carry on with honour and distinction the duties of office laid down by the late member whom he succeeds and whose genial and able presence is so sorely missed by us today.

My congratulations and best wishes also go to the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Leger). His recent address to which I listened with the greatest interest was a most praiseworthy effort. We on this side of the House were gratified at his victory in the far northern riding which he represents, and I am sure he will continue to make a worthy contribution to the proceedings of this House.

While I am on the subject of congratulations, I wish to say a kind word on behalf of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). His long experience in this Legislature and as the head of two important departments of government have given him an invaluable training for the high post he now occupies. He has always been a man of the people, and his career continually demonstrates he has not lost the common touch. I am heartily in accord with his approach to the difficult subject of Dominion-Provincial relations. I look forward to an early and complete clarification of the many problems that are mutual as between the

two governments, and I believe his attitude will presently herald a new day when our governments, provincial and Federal, will find a common meeting place from which all can work together for the good of the whole Canadian nation.

I regret the absence from our proceedings of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley). During his period of office he has won a warm place in the hearts of the people of this great province. I have always admired his crusade for the welfare of the little places and the little people. As a result of his leadership we find throughout Ontario more and better hospitals. It is no longer necessary to go to the big cities to get adequate hospital attention. All the hospitals, big and small, are now getting help more in line with their needs. The load of their finances is being taken off the shoulders of local real estate and in large measure, is being transferred to the broader shoulders of the provincial authority.

I do regret the present serious and prolonged period of ill-health which is afflicting the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley), and I sincerely hope that in the fulness of time he may again be found in his accustomed place.

I should like also to congratulate my good friend, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), in respect of the sound and thoughtful address he delivered on February 22nd last to the 1,000 or more delegates at the annual meeting of the Ontario Good Roads Association. More especially I should like to congratulate him on his announcement of the most comprehensive scheme of highway betterment and construction that has ever been made in this great province of Ontario. The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has vision as related to the future of this favored province. He has the confidence of his colleagues as evidenced

by their endorsation of his plans to give Ontario one of the finest highway systems on this continent. He will, I am sure, have the hearty endorsation of the hon. members of this honourable House when approval is requested for the substantial finance measures which will be required. I am sure that when given the opportunity to vote, this project will go through.

From the earliest days of land transportation on this continent our great arterial routes have followed an east-west course. A glance at any railway or highway map of Canada and the United States will make this clear to anyone. The present 5-year plan of the Department of Highways is thus an entirely logical development.

We have to deal with an immense and increasing flow of incoming traffic surging through our important ports of entry at Windsor, at Fort Erie and at Niagara Falls. In Eastern Ontario we have a most important inflow of traffic over the Thousand Islands Bridge, and again at the Quebec border. Much if not most of this traffic finds its way to No. 2 highway, originally the old military route from Montreal to Windsor. Through the energy of the Highways Department this old route has been completely paved. In part, for example east of Toronto, in the vicinity of Belleville and of Brockville, we find dual-lane pavements, but in the main we see the highway following the old route -- through crowded centres of population -- up hill and down dale -- with a very great number of curves and gradients that are not in accord with modern standards of highway construction.

I am very sure the people of the Windsor area and indeed of that whole thriving countryside to the west of us which contributes so much to Ontario's wealth and prosperity, will welcome the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett)

announcement they are to have new, modern and adequate highway accomodation. In no part of Ontario, however, will the 5-year plan receive a warmer welcome than in the East.

Highway No. 2, from Port Hope to Toronto is a bottleneck in the summer season, more especially as to week-end and holiday traffic. Trying conditions in this area will be eliminated, first from Oshawa to Newcastle, then from Newcastle to Port Hope. Then will come the easterly extension, giving added facilities and relief from trying problems in the Belleville-Kingston areas, and ultimately all along the route to the Quebec border. I know the hon. members from Western Ontario will deal with this whole subject as related to the important areas they represent. For the people of the East who have honored me with their confidence, may I say no announcement on the part of the government has been received with more satisfaction.

I agree most heartily with the observations of my friend, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds), as to the necessity of an early, in fact an immediate development of St. Lawrence power. This harnessing of more than 2,200,000 horse-power now going to waste must be brought to completion, and selfish and sectional objections, no matter where they come from, must be overruled. As the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) declared the other day, Ontario and New York State are big enough and strong enough, and I may add, determined enough to see that there is no more temporising with a project which means so much for the immense community that will benefit from this urgently needed development.

It is, therefore, doubly important that our highway transportation facilities in Eastern Ontario be enlarged and improved, so there may be no delay in capitalizing on the Eastern Ontario developments which will coincide with the

production of the added electrical energy which the St. Lawrence plan will unleash.

I was impressed with the clear and logical presentation of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to which I have already made reference, in his declaration that there must be not only a huge highways construction program, but also a preservation of our through highways, once they are built. Modern highways, more especially the dual-lane type, are built to enable traffic to move quickly and safely from one point to another. This type of highway cannot perform the dual function of giving free access to land and at the same time fulfill its primary purpose. This type of highway is designated for one job, and one job only, namely that of handling through traffic. I must say I agree

(page C-9 follows)

with the contention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) fortified as it is by the opinions of the highest engineering authorities, that feeder streets, private driveways and commercial establishments must not be allowed to tap indiscriminately these highways. After all, this type of highway costs $200,000 or $300,000 a mile, and we cannot afford to build them and then to have an immediate impairment of their functions.

I was glad to hear this straightforward announcement of policy. We are fortunate in having in this Province a reasonable and a reasoning people. Once these principles are understood--once our people realize these policies are formulated to bring the greatest good to the greatest number--they will meet with cheerful acceptance.

This whole huge plan of highway development will bring a new surge of prosperity to the whole of Ontario, north, east south and west, There will be abundant employment for those able and willing to work. There will be encouragement to industry to locate in our smaller centres as against concentration in our big cities. There will be real value added to every home and farm and industrial establishment within our borders.

I should here like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on his realistic approach to the subject of Dominion-Provincial relations. His sincere and friendly cooperation with the federal authorities in working out mutual plans for the betterment of Ontario and of Canada is worthy of the very hgihest commendation. I should like, however, to remind our friends at Ottawa that we of this House will not favor any measures which would tend to transfer any large measure of control in highway matters to the Federal authority. I know the railways would like to see

restrictions placed on freight haulage on our highways. I would point out, however, the railways' problems are not of our making. Truck transport is here, and here to stay. If the railways were not sufficiently alert to see the implications of the change in transportation which began to arrive with the advent of the automobile and the truck, then they have no one but themselves to blame.

I am proud of what this Government has been able to accomplish in the way of aid to the municipalities. When we assumed the responsibilities of office a few years ago, the Province was paying $3,600,000 a year in municipal road subsidies. Today, these subsidies exceed $23,000,000 a year. They mean more roads and better roads for the man on the back concession. When we took office about 400 municipal units were receiving provincial road subsidies. Today, 1,349 such units are receiving provincial aid. Today our cities, towns and incorporated villages are in receipt of provincial road subsidies whereas formerly only the townships and counties were receiving such aid.

One of our greatest problems today is to hold down the tax rate on real estate, more particularly on homes and farms. Municipal tax rates are still high enough, but, I ask you, just where would they be today if this Government had not come to the rescue by means of greatly increased provincial aid in the form of road subsidies and education grants?

In due course I have no doubt there will be a new deal as between the provinces and the Dominion. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the Premiers of the other provinces will be able to sit down at the conference table with the federal authorities and work out a delimitation

of tax fields which will settle a vexed and trying problem for some years to come. When this is accomplished, and I am sure it will be, the way will be paved for a revision of Provincial-municipal relations that will solve many urgent municipal problems without crippling in any way the finances of the Province. I do not know, of course, what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues may have in mind, but I am perfectly sure they will find a satisfactory and reasonable solution. One thing is clear enough. Real estate cannot stand any increase of the burdens which traditionally have been laid upon this tax field. Whatever the solution may be, I am sure our people will accept it cheerfully when the time comes.

When dealing with the subject of forest resources we are inclined to turn our thoughts to Northern Ontario where there are established so many of our forest industries. However, we still have some important forest resources in the East. We likewise have huge areas which lend themselves to reforestation, and what is more important, numerous initial steps have been taken along lines which will tend to restore our eastern forests to their former great importance.

One of the most important steps affecting Eastern Ontario was the establishment in 1946 of a new forest station at Kemptville. It was fitting that this little eastern community was chosen by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) Kemptville lies in an area much of which lends itself to reforestation. It is the home of the Kemptville Agricultural school. It is the birthplace and long time home of the late G. Howard Ferguson, on of Ontario's most distinguished sons who was an outstanding Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines as the department was known in his day, and who

later served his province as Prime Minister, a post which he would be proud and happy to see this evidence of foresight and progress, and more especially as the Kemptville Forest Station is located in the community he knew and loved.

In the same year, 1946, an additional station was established near Port Arthur while the areas of the three previously established stations, at St. Williams, at Midhurst and at Orono were enlarged. Are these stations known, used and appreciated by our people? The answer is obvious.

In 1943, 10 1/2 million trees were supplied from the Ontario forest stations. In 1949, shipments amounted to 18 million trees. Between 1945 and 1949, the area of municipal forests increased from 35,000 acres to a total of 80,000 acres.

My hon. friend, the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Leger) made some interesting references to developments in the North under the present Administration. Without going into the detail so ably covered by my hon. friend, I think we can take a justifiable satisfaction over the fact that two new pulp mills have been established, constituting two new and permanent industries around which the towns of Marathon and Terrace Bay have been brought into being. Four or five years ago Marathon was the site of an abandoned Indian burial ground. Today there is a new community with modern houses and apartments, stores, churches, a school, a theatre, with plumbing, electric light and power, and all the amenities of a thoroughly up-to-date town. The same thing is happening at Terrace Bay.

At Red Rock, a half-finished, inoperative mill has been completed, and again a new community has been established.

Sturgeon Falls has seen a revival of its basic industry by the renovation and reopening of the old Abitibi plant, now

making kraft and using all types of wood. At Espanola the old Spanish River paper mill has given the place to the huge Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment plant. In both instances ample payrolls are made available to revitalized communities. It is estimated that about 6,500 families have been given a new means of livelihood arising directly out of the forth-right policids of this Government.

It all goes to show what free enterprise can do under a Progressive Consorvative Government. I suppose these northern developments have brought $75 million or perhaps a hundred million dollars of new capital into the North in the past five or six years. In Ontario, yes, and in Alberta, we have a striking illustration of how capital flows into provinces with sound, progressive governments. In Saskatchewan, if current reports are correct, we see the same process in reverse -- that is to say capital is shunning a province where crackpot theories have to some extent largely supplanted sound business practice. No wonder that Saskatchewan's population is drifting away at a rate that alarms even its own government!

> Saskatchewan -- Population 1941, 896,000, 1946, 833,000, 1949, 861,000 -- Globe & Mail newspaper reports based on Dominion Government Statistics.

Since 1946, there has been under way a Forest Rescources Inventory of the 167,000 square miles of accessible forest in the Province. This comprehensive inventory now nearing conclusion will permit the organization of forest resources into a program that will make for a sustained yield.

I should like here to make a suggestion the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). Down in my part of the country there are still in existence a good many of the old perpetual timber licences as they are called. We have

a good amount of valuable pine and other standing timber -- and we shall have more of it as present policies become increasingly effective. However, what I want to suggest is simply this. We have a good many operators of small saw mills. These operators make modest livelihoods for themselves and they furnish an appreciable amount of local employment. The operation of these little mills furnishes a reasonable quantity of lumber largely used for local requirements. If the hon. Minister can formulate some general policies to give these small operators a better chance for permanent survival, he will be doing something of tangible value for that part of the Province I have the honor to represent. My colleagues from the East will, generally, I think agree with me. Mostly, they have similar conditions.

It is my theory that all of us should do all we can to help the little people, whatever the line of endeavor , for the big fellows are usually able to fairly well take care of themselves. ..nything....

(Take D-1 follows)

that can be done to aid these small operators to get a reasonable supply of raw material, and to help them get their little industries on a permanent basis will be very helpful to our eastern community. I know the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) will not object to my suggestion.

The union of the Departments of Lands and Forests with the Department of Game and Fisheries that took place in 1946, was a sensible and logical development. The protection of watersheds, the development of forest wealth and of Crown lands, stream diversions, lumber and pulp operations -- all these have a bearing on the welfare of the life in stream and forest. A unified control was a simple, direct and forward step. Under the new set-up the fish and wild life protection service has been doubled. Ten biologists have been added to the field staff. Members of the protective staff receive adequate training; they are placed in uniform; they are assured of permanent tenure of office on good behaviour; they are taking a real pride and an honest interest in the performance of their duties.

Down in my riding of Addington we appreciate the steps that have been taken to rehabilitate the fish hatchery at White Lake. Formerly this station comprised two rearing ponds. The number has been increased to seven. A comfortable house has been built for the superintendent, and provision is being made for suitable accommodation for his assistant.

Better highways, better lands and forests administration, and more attention to the protection and propagation of fish and wild life -- all these items are part of sound,

long-range policies that make eastern Ontario a still better spot in which to live, and that will incidentally aid our already important tourist trade.

I hope the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) will notice on one of his trips east on No. 7, which he probably he has already seen, what a beautiful and scenic place, and what a modest outlay of money would do at White Lake, and I hope he will arrange for tables and fireplaces, and have the land landscaped by the Department of Lands and Forests.

I want to commend the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) for one little thing, with which I had something to do myself. We have many lakes in my section of the country teeming with bass which are not large enough to catch. There are millions of them, 7, 8, 10 and 12 inches long. The cause of that I, of course, do not know; whether there is no food, or what it is, but you could fish all day and not catch a bass which is over 12 inches in length.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) is now netting these bass, and putting them into other lakes. There were 5,000 of them last year, and I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) that he continue that this year, as it certainly showed good results.

I think I should interject a kind word for all the members of our civil service. We have here a devoted body of men and women who are giving a high standard of service. Perhaps the rank and file feel sometimes they are not overpaid, but all the same, so far as I can observe, they are performing their duties cheerfully and well.

Salary schedules have been improved, and there is security of tenure of office -- something lacking under the former government, when we saw a cruel and vicious application of the spoils system at its worst. Personally, I appreciate the multitude of little courtesies extended to me by members of the service in many departments. It is a great help to me in my humble efforts to solve the little trials and problems of my constituents.

I should like to say a special word of commendation for the staff working under the direction of my good personal friend, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). His inspectors and his other officials are unsparing in their efforts to help our old-age pensioners, dependent mothers and others who need the aid of the state. They bring a real personal help and friendship to very many people who are not too well off in worldly goods or in friends, and I welcome this opportunity to thank them for their unceasing and kindly efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this administration in their work of giving Ontario sound, sane and progressive administration. In Australia and in New Zealand, after long years of painful, fumbling leftist administration, the people have hurled socialism from office. In Great Britain a socialist government trembles on the brink of disaster. Socialism is running true to form, for wherever it has been tried, it has failed.

Here in Ontario we are fortunate. We do not need to try socialism first hand, for its dismal record is spread before us. In our federal Parliament, its representation has just about disappeared. I have no doubt that the people

of Ontario will profit from what they have seen, in Australia, in New Zealand, in Great Britain, and again in Ottawa, and they will act accordingly when they next are given the opportunity.

To the rank and file of the socialist party in this country, I say there is plenty of room in the traditional parties for all of you. Bring your persons and your ideas and your ideals into one or the other of our traditional parties, and you can thus make your voices effective. We have in France the outstanding example of the weaknesses that spring from the existance of a multitude of splinter parties. We cannot afford to duplicate the experience of France in this Dominion, or in any of its provinces.

We have a skilled and intelligent people. We have an abundance of natural resources -- some partly developed -- others scarcely developed at all. We have abundance of opportunity. We have an abounding freedom. There is no part of the whole world where honesty, ability, energy and industry offer bigger rewards for all that is worthwhile. Shall we not, therefore, demand the full retention of all our cherished and basic freedoms, and push forward with confidence to a happy and abounding future?

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome to this Legislature this afternoon 120 students from the Oshawa Collegiate Vocational Institute, under the supervision of Mr. Arthur Slyfield. These young people are members of a students' coundl, and have a parliament of their own. They have a house of representatives and a senate.

Now, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I hope they willnot be too

critical of the proceedings here this afternoon, and I trust their visit today will be interesting and very informative. We all hope thattheir interest in public affairs will continue after their student days are over, because theirs is the responsibility to safeguard and maintain the democratic way of life we all enjoy today.

Now, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am sure we were all very pleased with the maiden efforts of the two hon. members who moved and seconded the address in reply tothe Speech from the Throne. (Mr. Reynolds; Mr. Leger).

It was announced that the government at Ottawa is installing loud-speaking equipment inthe House of Commons and that a microphone is to be installed onthe desk of every member, so that the members may be heard throught the chamber. I donot think such an installation would be necessary on the desks of the two hon.members (Mr. Reynolds; Mr. Leger) who were recently elected, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, because their voices were heard clearly and intelligibly throughout this chamber.

I am sorry Mr. Speaker is absent, because I would have liked to congratulate him on his second term as hon. Speaker of this Legislature. I want to say that I am quite sure he will govern this Assembly impartially.

I am sorry, too, that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is absent from the chamber. I wouldlike to congratulate him on his election to the leadership of the Conservative Party, and also to the Premiership of this province. It is a great hon ur for any man to become the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario, and I wish him well, for the short time he will be occupying that seat.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Now, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I want to express my disappointment that no mention is made of "social security" in the Speech from the Throne, or any measures of security for the people of this province. The only statement made was that this government is prepared to cooperate with the Federal government. We were hoping that when the Federal and provincial governments met last January, some statement would have been made at that time, but the meeting was adjourned until next September without any statement being made.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, why wait all that time for an important announcement like "social security"? Could it be that both the governments were hoping for the defeat of the Labor Government in England, and if that had happened, social security measures would have been shelved for some time to come? It could have been.

The hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) mentioned that the health scheme operating in British Columbia had shown a deficit for last year. Quite true. It did show a deficit for last year. The health scheme in Great Britain showed a deficit for the first year, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, and that, it seems to me, is really the reflection of the great need for such a service.

Hundreds of thousands of wage earners in this province today are living in dread of the cost of prolonged medical and hospital attention. Through that fear they keep away from the doctor, when some minor adjustment or treatment now would save them endless pain and needless expense.

It is understandable that a hospitalization program in this province will meet with some opposition. During my stay in Great Britain last year I knew of instances where some doctors, dentists and opticians were guilty of trying to

defeat that great experiment of the Labor Government. Fortunately, these were in the minority. That is quite a statement to make. I personally know of a circumstance which occurred in Great Britain, and I must substantiate those charges. Fortunately, they were in the minority but I would like to read to you an extract from a speech given in the House of Commons by the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Mr. Bevan:

> "To the extent that abuses exist in the Health Service, to the extent that it has been difficult to prevent them from arising, to the extent that there are faults, they arise directly from those parts of the Health Service that have to be articulated through private enterprise, opticians, dentists, chemists - but not much the chemists. It is awfully difficult to make the motives of private enterprise subserve a great social purpose. That is the difficulty which we are experiencing. But I am hoping to raise the ethical standards of the profession. I am hoping to put the nimbus of public service upon private enterprise brows. Before very long, as the years go by, I believe everybody will take a pride in this Service. It is alleviating pain, it is giving relief, and, at the same time, it is serving as an inspiration to the other nations of the earth."

This great social security scheme operating in Great Britain today has been criticized, condemned and opposed by the Conservative Party, yet the Conservative Party in Great Britain promised in the last election that they intended to

still maintain social security. The truth is, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that the Socialists in the Scandinavian countries, in New Zealand, Australia and Great Britain have done more in the five or ten years during their administration than the Liberal or Conservative governments have done in 100 years.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): The housing program of this government has been a disappointment. It is stated in the Speech from the Throne that the government has loaned $17,000,000 to 15,000 Ontario families to own their own homes. The figures are quite impressive. Let us break these figures down and see what we get. It means that 15,000 families were loaned on an average of $1135 each to help them in purchasing a new home. What the government was doing was just making it easier for the mortgage companies to induce some people, desperate for decent housing accommodation, to accept commitments they can never fulfill.

The Speech from the Throne states,

> "But other arrangements are in the course of completion which will stimulate the construction of many thousands of new low-cost homes where they are needed most. The greatest encouragement and assistance will be extended to enable those who will occupy those low-cost homes to own them."

On that statement I do not think the government can be too happy for it is a confession the efforts of these last few years by this government have fallen far short of the people's need.

The new legislation introduced by the government is intended to give our people badly-needed homes, but we on

this side of the House are not too hopeful.

Now, a word about the new Municipal Improvement Corporation Act.

The principle is a very good one, but the government is not prepared to go far enough. What is the good of buying debentures from the municipalities, and charging about 3½% interest? That interest is far too high. Why, most municipalities can get a better rate than that on the open market. At interest rates of from 2% to 2½%, it would be a very fine piece of legislation. I know the opposition from the bond houses will be tremendous, but this government could overcome that, if it wanted to.

I wouldlike to see the idea extended, of course, at a much lower rate of interest than 3½%, because today many muhicipalities before their local taxes become due are compelled to finance their operation and maintenance costs for the first six months of the year by borrowing fromthe banks at 4% interest. Millions of dollars are borrowed from the banks by the minor and major municipalities, and I think if the scope of the Municipal Improvement Corporation was extended, savings could be effected along those lines.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Why do they not have the collection of their taxes earlier?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): That is one remedy, I agree. Up to now they have not seen fit to. But the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will admit the banks are collecting a lot of money at 4%, on the money borrowed from the banks by the muhicipalities. The rate is far too high, at 4%.

(Page D-10 follows)

Municipalities already having debentures paying a high rate of interest in some cases as much as 5½ percent. could be encouraged to redeem them and re-issue with the corporation. I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that is one item the government could discuss with the federal government at the conference in September. If the federal government can borrow from the Bank of Canada at very low rates of interest, I see no reason why that privilege should not be extended to the provinces. After all, it is supposed to be our bank.

I regret, Mr.Speaker, no mention is made of the great increase in unemployment. That is understandable, I suppose, because the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made the government attitude very plain last fall. When a deputation from a northern city discussed with him the tremendous increase in unemployment in that city and asked for government assistance, they did not get very much satisfaction. In fact, a lady councillor with that deputation said that the visit had been a waste of time. The other day the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said this relief problem will disappear in good time.

Now, last year, on my visit to Great Britain, when staying in London, one afternoon we went along to the House of Commons and listened to a debate, and during the discussion, full employment was mentioned, and a Conservative member arose and said that he disagreed with full employment, that he believed that a moderate degree of unemployment was essential -- a moderate degree of unemployment was essential.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is a "moderate degree of unemployment"?

I will give you one or two quotations from the debates in the House of Commons in Great Britain. Here is one from a Conservative member:

> "Before the world gets back to normal, we must have eleven people wanting ten jobs; ten percent. of the working people must be unemployed. Empty bellies are the only thing which will make people work."

Then, here is another one:

> "Unemployment remains at an abnormally low figure, of less than two percent., a level far too low to permit any real flexibility in our economy."

That was the "flexibility" about which the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was speaking the other day.

According to the statement issued by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion (Mr. St. Laurent), he said it was not the responsibility of government to provide anybody with jobs; it was the responsibility of free enterprise.

According to the statement made the other day by the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr.Frost) ... it is not the responsibility of the provincial government, either. He said, "These things will disappear in good time".

The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) in his speech the other day mentioned that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was posing as a "great benefactor". I think he is now posing as a "great magician", when he says it will "disappear in time".

I plead with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to consider this relief problem, for at the present time the

local municipalities have to bear the cost of maintenance of employable people on relief, one hundred percent. Costs for relief for the year have increased by as much as one hundred percent. in some municipalities over 1948, and will show a marked increase again this year.

The serious condition of agriculture is also stressed and the Throne Speech mentions the "aftermath of war", and particularly, "currency difficulties" have created problems for agriculture. The inter-dependence of agriculture and labour is mentioned, and its importance cannot be emphasized too strongly. One thing we must realize is this, some portion of our exports for agriculture is lost for some time, but we still have our domestic market, and I wonder if we realize that is dwindling too.

For with 350,000 men unemployed, and that is only the number officially unemployed according to the records of the employment service, we have, taking the average of three to a family, close to a million people today in this Dominion whose purchasing power has been greatly curtailed, and who are not now in a position to buy the essentials for a decent livelihood.

There are also aged persons trying to get by on the miserly small old-age pensions of from 30 to 40 dollars per month. The same can be said for the poor unfortunate people trying to live on the mothers' allowance. The unemployed, the aged pensioner, the recipients of mothers' allowances, are all potential customers for agriculture, but through the miserly policies of this government, they are precluded from buying essential foods to maintain a decent standard of living.

This is a market which if this government so desired, could give agriculture some assistance at the present time.

The dwindling domestic market should be a matter of great concern to everyone, and I think it is, Mr. Speaker, to everyone except this government.

I did intend to discuss the new Labour Act, but I will refrain from any further discussion of this Bill, because it is now before the House.

I am very pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) intends to increase the grants on education, and in extending grants on a population basis, he is admitting the hopelessness of grants based on assessment.

This is a step in the right direction, for it will be many, many years before an equitable system of assessment prevails throughout this province. I think the cost of education should be discussed with the federal government, for I am sure the two governments should assume this responsibility.

I am quite sure we will wait a long time before we have an equitable system of assessment in the province of Ontario. As I say, I think the cost of education should be discussed with the federal government in September, for I am sure the two governments should assume the cost of education. If this government and the Dominion government accepted the full cost of education, I feel quite sure that much of the squabbling and wrangling going on in Toronto and the adjacent area over amalgamation, or annexation, whichever you like to call it, would be ended.

If the government would accept the full cost of education, it would put a stop to that.

In fact, I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) is most commendable, that is, that the two governments should assume the responsibility of highway maintenance, and the cost of education.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to give you some idea of how burdensome the cost of education is to the municipalities, we must read the annual report of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) just published for the year 1949, and in that, we see the percentage cost of education in relation to other municipal taxes is, for the cities, 33.4 percent., for the towns 32.5 percent., for the villages 32.4 percent., and for the townships 35.5 percent. That means that one third of the total taxes collected in the municipalities throughout the province of Ontario goes toward the cost of education.

The increased grants on education, I am quite sure, will be appreciated by the municipalities, at the present time.

Now, I would like to say something about the unsatisfied judgment fund. When discussing the revenue of the Highways Department last week, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) said that the fund is a very poor thing. I agree with him. The scheme is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, but it is a recognition of the principle that the distress of one is the responsibility of all.

I am quite sure if the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) would extend this principle to a complete automobile insurance plan, patterned along the lines of

the Province of Saskatchewan, it would mean a tremendous saving to motorists in this province. I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to consider this extension.

I know he will meet with tremendous opposition from vested interests, but I am sure he will receive the support of the motorists of the province, if he would consider compulsory insurance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) announce the Department was now ready to extend the New Highway east of Oshawa. It was most welcome, because the two arterial roads in the city of Oshawa have been and still are terribly congested.

(Take E-1 follows)

MR. THOMAS: (Ontario): We hope that now the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has decided to proceed with this work, he will issue a statement as early as possible, I feel it is in the public interest to do so. I have reason to believe that speculation in real estate is taking place in this area, and I do hope that the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) will release this information as soon as it is available.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Page E-2 follows)

MR. E. SANDERCOCK (Hastings West): Mr. Speaker, permit me to extend to you my sincere congratulations for the very efficient manner in which the business of this Legislature is conducted. It has been an experience for me to sit here and observe the very capable manner in which you handle the affairs of this House.

In making these remarks today, I am encouraged by the very fine speeches delivered by the mover and seconder to the Speech from the Throne. In my humble opinion these two hon. gentlemen are going to make great contributions to the work of this Legislature. Before proceeding further with my remarks, I wish to thank the hon. members of this House for the many kind expressions of anxiety received by Mrs. Sandercock and myself during the period I was confined to the Belleville General Hospital, recuperating from the effects of a car accident. Believe me, this thoughtfulness was sincerely appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion I represent one of the most loyal and progressive ridings in this great province. I am honoured to be a supporter of this government and it is a privilege for me to serve the electorate of Hastings West. This riding covers a distance in excess of one hundred miles; located in the south, we have the city of Belleville and the town of Trenton, two very prosperous and highly industrialized centres, with many diversified industries manufacturing commodities ranging from fine jewellery to large steel bridges. North from Trenton is the new town of Batawa, which provides footwear to a large percentage of the citizens of this country. Adjoining Batawa is the picturesque village of Frankford, on the Trent Canal, a growing tourist centre. The thriving village

of Stirling centres one of the best farming areas in the district. The progressive village of Marmora is adjoined by Deloro, the home of the Deloro Smelting and Refining Company.

Proceeding further north we have Coe Hill, business centre for that area, and in the northern section of the county we have the well-known village of Bancroft, which is one of the most beautiful communities in Ontario with its new modern schools, hospital, swimming pool and community centre. It is the Divisional Headquarters for the Departments of Highways and Lands and Forests.

In addition to these communities mentioned, Hastings West has a large rural population. These people are engaged principally in mixed and dairy farming, with the manufacture of cheese being our main contribution to the agricultural wealth of this province. Every person in this province should know that Ontario produces the best cheese, and that Ontario cheese is good to eat since it has the finest flavour in the world.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SANDERCOCK: Cheese is necessary for the health of every citizen, as it is a cheap source of calcium and protein, both of which are required to promote growth; so why not eat the best -- Ontario cheese.

You will realize from this how important it is that cheese be included in some form of the regular diet for our children. Cheese can be used by itself, or to improve the flavour of other foods. It has been a source of great disappointment to me to find that more cheese is not consumed in the hotels, restaurants, cafeterias of this city and in these buildings. I am sure, on sampling the package of cheese on your desk, you will find this product of the

county of Hastings very tasty. I cannot stress anything more important to the hon. members of this House than the promotion and encouragement of the consumption of Ontario cheese.

The citizens of my riding are concerned about the price of cheese, and for that matter, hope that the market price of all farm produce can be maintained at a reasonable level. It is important that ready markets are available and the price obtained for the produce be kept in line with other commodities, for when the farmer is prosperous, the working man, the business man and the professional man are prosperous as well.

Mr. Speaker, I find in the short time at my disposal it is difficult for me to pay tribute to all the hon. Ministers in this government, who have made such great contributions to the well-being of the citizens of Hastings West, for under the leadership of the Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the services rendered by all the departments of the government have been expanded beyond anything we had hoped to achieve. The citizens of Hastings West recognize that the Frost government is a progressive government and give credit for its many accomplishments. Therefore, you will understand it is not possible for me to select any one department of the government that has made the greatest contribution to the riding of Hastings West.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): What about the hon. Attorney-General(Mr. Porter).

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Figure out the sore spot..

MR. SANDERCOCK: In my remarks this afternoon, I am prompted to speak on a subject in which I have considerable intimate knowledge. Having served as Superintendent of a Home for the Aged for twenty years, you will understand how keenly my interest is in this phase of welfare work. The Department of Public Welfare, in my opinion, is one of the most important in the Government. It touches directly on the lives of over 140,000 people in Ontario. The work carried on under the direction of the Hon. William Goodfellow, has been outstanding in every respect, and particularly so in the field of service and treatment given to the aged people in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, we all are aware of the great changes that have taken place in the administration of Old Age Pensions. Each one of us present has had some experience with the work of this branch of that department. However, it is with the development of Homes for the Aged that I am chiefly concerned. From my knowledge of Homes forthe Aged, there has been no marked change for over one hundred years in the attitude of either the Provincial or Federal Governments toward this most important service, until recently, when the Progressive-Conservative Government came into power. Prior to the advent of this Government, municipalities had been charged almost entirely with the maintenance and treatment of elderly people in Homes for the Aged. What a tremendous change has taken place since I was first appointed Superintendent of the County Home at Belleville in 1929. At that

time the taxpayer of the County was entirely responsible for the residents, and the Boards of Management had to depend on the resources of the municipalities in developing a program to provide for the care of these people.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the need for this type of accommodation to care for our elderly citizens. The Hon. Mr. Goodfellow has said, and I quote, "We are going to give precedence to this program since I feel it is one of the greatest problems we are facing today." --Hastings will be the first County in the Province to erect a new modern Home for the Aged under this program fostered by Mr. Goodfellow and this Government, which provides for the payment by the Province of 50% of the cost for erecting new Homes and 50% of the cost of maintaining the aged people in these Homes.

MR. A.A.MacLEOD (Bellwoods): How old is the home you have there today?

MR. SANDERCOCK: Everyone understands what Provincial participation willmean to the ratepayer in the County, This new type of Home makes available to the old people, a measure of privacy whereby married couples will be permitted to live together, and invalid persons will receive nursing care. These homes will be of the most modern design and will provide safeguards against fire hazard. They will be equipped in every detail with modern conveniences. During my tenure of office as Superintendent, I served as President of an organization devoted to promoting better Homes for the Aged, and in this capacity visited almost every Home in the Province, This gives me confidence to say, with some authority, that this project by the Government to assist the municipalities in constructing and maintaining Homes for the Aged is the most outstanding development in the field of welfare.

I am advised that some five millions of dollars will be expended in the construction and extension of Homes, and this represents only the initial stages in the expansion of this service in Ontario. In that event, this Government will be contributing a very large sum towards the furtherance of this work. I have had an opportunity to examine the new Regulations made under the Homes for the Aged Act, and feel confident these Regulations will be favourably received, and be to the advantage of the municipality and the people admitted to these Homes. I am assured by the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) that guidance and assistance will be given to the municipalities in applying these Regulations and completing the forms set out therein. In my opinion, the Frost government has made a very progressive move in interducing this welfare legislation, and thus providing congenial surroundings for our veteran citizens.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer you my congratulations in keeping this House in order, and in such a kindly and gentlemanly manner. I also wish to congratulate you on being able to dispose of the loud-speaker system we had to use in the House when the House first assembled.

I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion. They did a good job. They did a very good job in the most difficult task assigned to them. They discharged their duties in a very commendable manner. I also offer my congratulations to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in the new position he has assumed in our province. It is one of the highest that can be given to a resident of Ontario.

Also to the hon. ministers who have changed their

portfolios, and the new hon. ministers, I extend my congratulations.

Now, I come to a different type of congra lation; that is to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett). Some time ago we approached the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) king him to remodel the Opposition quarters, and present plans and specifications, and I must say he did a very first-class job. The thanks of the whole Opposition go to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett). I think he did better than he thought he would. We had a number of his own party members in to examine the quarters, and they were surprised at the comfort and convenience we received from the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) and you could see a gleam in their eyes, and perhaps the day will come when they will take over these quarters, and I imagine they felt that they would not be so badly off after all.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of speeches in the House, and the main problems have been covered several times, and I believe I am left the option only of going through the north again, as has been my custom in the past, and give the House an idea of the problems of northern Ontario.

First, while the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is in his seat, I wish to talk about highways. Two of my colleagues to the right, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) and the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) have extolled the virtue of the north shore route. This is one case when friendship ceases. I am going to deal with highway number eleven.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GRUMMETT: I have a friend somewhere in the House.

Highways number eleven has been constructed for some considerable years, and is the highway now promoted to a

first-class highway, with only a small portion of it to be surfaced, and with a little help we can change that into a trans-Canada highway. The route around the north shore will require a tremendous amount of construction. Even the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) admitted we had one hundred and seventy miles of new construction.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the money required for that new construction will more than total all the money required for placing highway number eleven in the condition where it will become one of the best highways in the province of Ontario.

In fact, the money required to construct one mile of this section of highway along the north shore -- that is, in the portion that is not open -- would furnish not less than ten to fifteen miles of highway on number eleven. Multiply one hundred and seventy by ten and you get the distance required to complete number eleven highway.

Now, I want to speak on some other portions of the highways in northern Ontario. Two or three years ago, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) had an interview with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in connection with another road from Matchewan to Swastika. The hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) assured us that it would be constructed within two years, he said half in the first year and the remainder in the second year. Nine miles were constructed; the remainder was not completed. Sixteen miles remains. The situation at Matchewan, anyone who visit there must leave highway number eleven at New Liskeard and go seventy-five miles or more almost parallel with number eleven to Matchewan. When they hit Matchewan, they hit a dead end, and the construction of twenty-five miles from Matchewan to Swastika would give them an outlet onto number eleven, some considerable distance

north.

Failing this outlet, if they intend to travel north, they have to go back to New Liskeard and then go north again. I hope the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) in his plans for road building in northern Ontario, will keep that in mind and give high privileges to the Matchewan - Swastika section of the highway.

Another portion of roadway to which I referred on several occasions is the Timmins - Sudbury highway. A very small portion of this road has been built, just a small artery leading out of Timmins. The construction of a roadway from Timmins to Sudbury will open up a vast area of country suitable for fishing, hunting, and tourists; farming, and mining, in fact, every industry for which the north is known.

Another section, which would perhaps give my friend, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) the outlet that he has been seeking, would be a road from Timmins to Sault Ste. Marie, which would permit the resident of Sault Ste. Marie to take a trip to Timmins and see some very scenic country. The roadway along the north shore would be very unimpressive owing to the jumble of rock and unscenic territory. In opening up a highway from Sudbury to Timmins, you will develop one of the best areas in the country for the tourist business, and I would ask the hon. min ster in charge (Mr. Cecile) of the tourist department to use his influence with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) and get this roadway constructed.

Now, a few words about the secondary roads in northern Ontario. We have not the advantage of old Ontario, who have had their roads for considerable years. The majority of your roads were started fifty or sixty years ago. Our roads,

the majority of them, have only been started within the past eight to ten years. I will admit the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) has done a lot for us in the north, but I am asking him to make the grants a little higher in northern Ontario, owing to the fact that we started from scratch, whereas old Ontario has had their roads for a long time. Roads in our ridings are of practically new construction, and I believe the townships deserve a little more consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the next item about which I wish to speak concerns mining. Mining is the biggest industry in my riding. In fact, my riding is the only one that has any gold mining to any extent. Mining is also one of the biggest industries in the province of Ontario. Quite recently, in fact, just last year, a new development was brought in in northern Ontario -- and that is asbestos -- not far from Matheson in Monro township. That industry has been proven, and we will have a considerable number of years of development and production of asbestos in Munroe. That has been added to the gold in my riding.

In connection with gold mining, I want to point out the advantages given to mines at the expense of the mining municipalities. Suppose that a mine is discovered in northern Ontario; that mine is not taxed as any other business. Taxation of a mine is by a fixed taxation on its profits. The taxation on any other business is on the value of the property, the land and the buildings that may be erected thereon. But a mine is only taxed on profits. When the Mining Tax Act was first introduced, in 1907 I believe it was, the government then saw fit to provide that the municipality in which a mine existed could not tax it as an ordinary business. Taxation only was based on the profits. If you want to compare

the result of that position, I would ask you to compare two businesses starting in operation in northern Ontario -- one a mine, A group of men discover a mine and they start to develop it and produce ore.

(Take F follows)

They pay no taxes whatsoever to the municipality, they pay taxes when they start to make a profit, but here is a peculiar situation: There is a provision in the Act that they do not have to pay any taxes until they have made $10,000 profit. That is, the first $10,000 profit is exempt from taxation. That is another benefit given to the mine operators.

If, on the other hand, a group of men started in business as a lumber yard or any other type of industrial business, those men would have their property taxed from the very day they started operations. They would pay the municipal tax on the value off their plant, on the value of their land and of their buildings, and if they went "in the red" for the first two or three years, that would not matter one bit to the municipal authorities, they would collect taxes from them. But inthe case of the mines, we see them getting a $10,000 exemption from taxation.

Of course the mines do pay taxes, certain taxes. The taxing of the mines, to a big extent, is in the hands of the Federal government, with the cooperation of the provincial government. On every tax dollar collected from a mine, 88 cents goes to the Federal government, 8 cents to the provincial government and 4 cents to the municipal government. That is a very unfair distribution of the taxes received from mines, and I hope thehon. Ministers of the province, when they attend the Dominion-Provincial Conference, will keep that in mind.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Of course my hon. friend (Mr. Grummett) does not include in those figures the amount of subvention that we pay to the municipalities, which is very large.

MR. GRUMMETT: I was coming to that.

MR. FROST: That is very considerable.

MR. GRUMMETT: I was coming to that.

MR. FROST: Well, I thought you ought to.

MR. GRUMMETT: Owing to the agitation of the northern Ontario mining municipalities, the government has, on different occasions, and they are at the present time, paying what the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) calls a subvention, or in other words it is a handout to the mining municipalities of the north. They have come down here pleading their case year after year and eventually they persuaded the government that they did need assistance. The government did not give them the assistance they asked for. They asked for changes in The Assessment Act; they asked for the right to tax the mining properties as they tax any other business in the municipality; but the government would not concede that right to the mining municipalities, they said: "Here, we will give you a handout, or a subvention."

Those mining municipalities have got to come back every year to this government.

MR. FROST: No, no. Good for five years.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Not Sudbury.

MR. GRUMMETT: Just Sudbury only, with its $10,000,000.

MR. FROST: No, the other people, their arrangement was, I think, to cover up to 1952-53.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): What about Cobalt? You forgot about that.

MR. FROST: I think we are helping Cobalt out, are we not?

MR. TAYLOR: No, it was not politically expedient.

MR. FROST: I will take care of that next time.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, the subventions may be now arranged for five years, but that is the first I have heard about it. Of course I did hear about Sudbury, as that was a

very big grant---$100,000 a year for ten years for Sudbury, the nickel mining industry.

HON. W. F. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): I wonder if I may ask the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) what contribution the nickel industry makes to the treasury of this province in comparison with other industries?

MR. GRUMMETT: Not as much as the gold-mining industry.

MR. GEMMELL: Can you quote those figures?

MR. GRUMMETT: I have not got it here. Perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) will supply me with them now.

MR. GEMMELL: I wish you could quote them to the House.

MR. GRUMMETT: I would like to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) give us the figures. As I was saying, the grants made to mining municipalities is not a fair way to deal with them. These municipalities dislike to accept something as a gift or an obligation from the government when they should be able to tax the mines as a right of taxation.

And on top of that, just shortly before an election we find these subventions increased for certain municipalities and held back or deferred in the case of other municipalities. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) he has assumed a new portfolio, that he make an endeavor to satisfy the claims of the Northern Ontario Association of Mining Municipalities. They have put their problems before this govdrnment on many occasions and I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) is fully familiar with the requests made by them.

Another thing in connection with taxation which I forgot to mention is that after the $10,000 exemption is granted and you proceed to tax mines, the rate of taxation is only 15 mills on the first $1,333,333. After you reach that amount,

you increase the taxation to 25 mills.

MR. GEMMELL: That is being done under The Mining Tax amendment. That returns to the municipality. That is not the taxation of the mines.

MR. GRUMMETT: That used to be the method of taxing the mines.

MR. GEMMELL: Six, eight and nine per cent.

MR. GRUMMETT: I beg your pardon?

MR. GEMMELL: It works out at six, eight and nine per cent.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes. Now, the mining municipalities have got to supply the services required in all towns to the employees of these mines. They have to supply water works, sewers, sidewalks, hospitalization, police protection and all the other municipal services. But all they get back from the mines is just what the government wishes to give them, that is a subvention under the sole control of this government, not a taxation right. The majority of hon.members of this House know what per cent. industry contributes toward their taxation. I wonder if they understand that in the municipalities of the north, especially Timmins and Kirkland Lake, the home-owner contributes 85% of the taxes, in spite of the fact the home owner is living in a great industrial locality. That is, the mines are not contributing their fair share to the taxation.

Having considered the fact that the home owners pay 85% of the taxes and the poor mines may be in an unfortunate position that they cannot pay any more, I wouldlike to read to you an article that appeared inthe Toronto Telegram, Tuesday, March 14, 1950:

"ONTARIO MINE DIVIDENDS NOW OVER HALF A BILLION

"Four years after the Porcupine camp yielded its

"first gold discovery, dividend dollars started flowing into the hands of Canadian investors---"

AN hon. MEMBER: Not New York?

MR. GRUMMETT: The article states "Canadian investors."

"---bent on following the fortunes of producing properties in Ontario.

"Since Hollinger's initial declaration of $270,000 in 1912, The Telegram finds that the camp has paid out over $275,000,000 in dividends. Up to the end of 1949 the area' producers distributed roughly 37% of dollar income derived from gold and silver production of $732,560,000, dating from commencement of milling operations at Dome in 1910.

"Looking into the entire Ontario dividend-producing picture, the mines of the province have paid out a total $547,361,469 during the period 1912 to 1949. While Ontario's gold and silver recovery dates back long before the discovery of the Porcupine camp, the establishment of the gold producers in that area inaugurated the practise of paying a portion of their annual earningsin dividends."

But, I might say, paying very little towards the upkeep of the municipalities in which they are situated.

So much for mining, Mr. Speaker. I wish to say a few words about farming. It may be the opinion of many of the hon. members here in the House that there is very little farming in the north, but I can assure them we have some of the best farming land in Ontario. We have produced crops of outstanding potatoes and grains.

However, our farmers need some encouragement and some

help. They are scattered throughout a sparsely-settled area and, in addition to roads, they need help in clearing their land. I believe the assistance already given has encouraged some of them, but I would like to see the grants for clearing land increased in northern Ontario.

At the present time all of the northern municipalities are engaged in holding meetings and conferences leading to inviting unemployed and others in Ontario to migrate to the north this coming Summer. I would like to point out that before any settlers are permitted to take up land, they be carefully screened. We saw what happened inthe 30s when settlers from the York Townships were sent into the north and placed on farms. A lot of those men knew nothing whatsoever about farming. They built their homes and cleared a little land and immediately war was declared and their old jobs were open, they abandoned those farms and returned to the industrial concerns in which they had worked prior to being sent north, or prior to losing their jobs here which placed them in the position they were sent to northern Ontario.

In any future scheme of settlement, I hope only bona fide farmers will be placed on the land in northern Ontario. Farming is an arduous and difficult task. It requires, in old Ontario, an experienced farmer, and in northern Ontario it requires a whole lot more, it requires the ability to stick with it through difficult times. A person capable of doing that is the only farmer who should be permitted to settle in northern Ontario.

Also as an encouragement to our farmers, we should have greater facilities for storing and grading produce. Just one or two towns have as yet built cold storage plants, Cochrane and Englehart, I believe, are two of the places. The vast number of settlements and towns are without any

means of grading and storing their produce, and this means a tremendous loss onthe market.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to refer to one or two matters of a general nature. We have in the north a serious problem in the desertion of families by the heads of those families. That is, the father leaves the wife and children to shift for themselves and they become a burden on the municipalities. I know machinery is set up in our present Statutes for the punishment of those who desert their families and leave them in this condition, but I think we are lax, we are not enforcing these Statutes. These men walk away with impunity and leave their wives and children to be looked after by the municipalities and if those deserted are able by any means to get along without assistance from the municipality, they are expected to do so. No one pays any attention to their plight until that plight means a money loss to the municipality and then someone may step in. The police are not willing to search out the offender and bring him back for punishment.

Take on the other hand, should someone break into a store and steal perhaps $50 or $60 worth of tools or equipment or something of that nature, the whole police force of the province is out to hunt him down. In other words, the wrong committed against property isregarded as a greater wrong than a wrong committed against humanity. No one is prepared to hunt down the delinquent father who has neglected his wife and childrenuntil he owes the municipality a considerable sum of money.

I remember reading inthe press last year of two men in Timmins who were brought into court for neglecting their families and were sent to jail for six and nine months respectively. However, the greater part of the story played

up in the press related to the amount of money they owed the municipality, in the one case I believe it was $2600 and in the other around $3900. That was the amount that had been paid for the support of their families during the time those delinquent fathers were absent. I think we should make an effort to punish these men who desert their families.

Again I want to refer to another thing which places a great burden on the municipalities of the north, and that is the children of unmarried mothers. It is costing the municipalities of the north a great deal of money to provide for children of unmarried women. And again, no effort is made to punish the putative father. Some years ago before the burden of supporting these children was placed on municipalities on the same basis it isplaced now, the putative father was followed up by some official of the Children's Aid Society, who saw to it that he was brought into court and if there was sufficient evidence he was compelled to support the child until it reached the age of 16.

Quite a number of cases were brought into court ten or fifteen years ago, but today you will not see one in a hundred, the Children's Aid Society seems to take it for granted the municipality will pay one dollar per day anyway for the support of that child and it isnot worth their while to run down the father and see that he in turn bears his responsibility, that he pays for what he has done.

The breakdown in family life and parental responsibility in the province of Ontario is adding a tremendous burden to our taxes. Those two things alone, children of unmarried mothers and the deserted wives and families, have added greatly to the burden of municipalities have to bear, and we can do someth ng about it. I think if our police forces were instructed to vigorously follow up any desertion immediately it

occurs---do not wait for two or three years, but immediately the desertion occurs, follow it up---we would see that a smaller number of men took their family responsibilities lightly.

In connection with the usual talk about the liquor problem, on which we had quite a lengthy speech in the House this afternoon, I am only going to refer to one phase of it, which I think should be brought to the attention of the House, and that is minors drinking in hotels. Quite a number of hotels have lost their licenses lately for permitting minors to drink on their premises. I hold no brief for the hotels, Mr. Speaker, but I think something ought to be done to see that those who break the law, those minors who go into hotels and break the law, should pay a little more penalty than they have under the present regulations. Under our regulations at the present time if a man gets drunk, on the first offence he is fined perhaps $10 and on the second one maybe up to $50, and on the third offence he goes to jail. In connection with these young minors, and some of them, mind you, are very determined to break the law, and it is nothing else, they feel they have accomplished something pretty smart in going out and breaking the law, they do so week after week and the punishment received by them is merely a light fine. That is nothing, they only laugh at the courts when they pay a light fine. Something will have to be done to see that those minors who break the law, if they break it more than once, receive a stiffer penalty than they have in the past.

In connection with the liquor problem, I wouldlike to report to the House, Mr. Speaker, through you, that last December we had a vote in Timmins on the cocktail lounge question. We also had a vote in Tisdale Township, which is a township adjacent to Timmins. In Timmins the result

was four to one against the cocktail lounge.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GRUMMETT: And in Tisdale, three to one, which will perhaps convince hon. members of old Ontario, Mr. Speaker, that the north is not what it is always called, "the wild and woolly north."

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Hear, hear.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish now to take a few moments of the time of this House in referring to old Ontario. I have been dealing with northern Ontario for some time and I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members something I think we have lost sight of, and that is the problem of rural Ontario. The problem of rural Ontario is that the population of that area is drifting to the cities and the big towns. What we need in Ontario is decentralization. All our big cities and towns in old Ontario are looking for any business which may come out from Britain or over from the United States, and if they are looking for a site, all these cities and towns are out to get them to locate in their localities. Hence, the result we have here in Ontario of Toronto bursting at her seams and pushing the twelve or thirteen other municipalities around for some room. If those industries had been scattered more equitably across the province, we would find a better situation in the whole province. Decentralization will solve a lot of the difficulties of old Ontario.

MR. NIXON: How can that be brought about?

MR. GRUMMETT: Encouragement. Stop the big cities from trying to grab off all the business concerns thatare looking for an opening.

MR. FROST: How would you do that?

MR. GRUMMETT: Eeucation, I expect, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost).

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Free enterprise makes it difficult.

MR. FROST: I have tried to educate them, and you know what they say to me.

AN hon. MEMBER: Advanced education.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): But you tried to do it in a year!

MR. GRUMMETT: I am waiting and watching for the report of the Select Committee on Conservation. I think they can do a lot towards pointing the way to help old Ontario. We have permitted our forests to be destroyed in old Ontario. One of my first recollections as a youngster is that of watching, in my old township of Osprey in Grey County, the clearing of the forests. They did not clear the forests to haul the timber to the mills. They cleared the forests by chopping the trees in the winter time and during their spare time in the Summer hauling those logs into great piles and burning them. They destroyed the greater portion of the timber of Ontario. If those pioneers had only known and left that crop of timber standing, it would have been today worth many times the grain they have grown on that same land in the time which has expired since the land was cleared.

The clearing of the forests resulted in the loss of a considerable number of small industries in the different villages. Our villages are disappearing in old Ontario. I would like to give you the experience of one village which I knowwell. I know the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail), the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Phillips) will know it well also. It is Wareham. They were all born within a very few miles of that village of Wareham, which was my own village. Fifty years ago, we had in that village two saw mills, one driven by steam and one by water power. We had a store, a post office, a blacksmith shop, a brick yard, a tannery.

AN hon. MEMBER: And a cocktail lounge?

MR. GRUMMETT: And a wheelwright shop. In addition to that, of course, we had the church and the school.

MR. MacLEOD: That would help.

AN hon. MEMBER: Any hotels?

MR. GRUMMETT: No hotels whatsoever. Today only the school and the church remain. They are all that are left of what constituted a very nice little village in old Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, that same situation can be repeated many times throughout the province. The people have left the farming areas and come to the cities, simply because industry has collected in the cities and is bringing these young people in, and, in addition to that, the farmers didnot have the conveniences the city people were able to obtain. Under the changes which have occurred in the past few years, the farmers are living a much better life. The development of rural power has given them something that willplace their standard of living ona par with the city dwellers, and I am hoping that in the report of the Select Committee on Conservation we will see something which will build again the farming areas of old Ontario because, after all, Mr. Speaker, the stability of our province rests upon our rural areas.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GRUMMETT: When they are prosperous and thriving again as they were 40 or 50 years ago, then our province willbecome the great province, both industrially and agriculturally, that it was intended to be.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take G follows)

MR. T. K. FOSTER (Bruce): Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate for the first time in this debate, it would not be amiss for me to extend to you again my congratulations and appreciation for the goodwill and good fellowshipI have been accorded since coming to this House. I would also wish to compliment the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) at this time on his elevation to such a high office. I compliment him on the way he is conducting the affairs of this province. I would also like to express my sincere wish for an early return to their duties of the hon. members who are not present, especially the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley). In the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) we have a native Bruce County boy and every resident of the County of Bruce is pulling for an eary recovery for him. He is a friend of all, is the hon. Minister of Health of the province of Ontario (Mr. Kelley).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOSTER: I would also like to pay to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) in passing, my compliments on the moving the reply to the Speech from the Throne, I enjoyed my visit to the constituency of Leeds, although, at that time I had not made his acquaintance. Since meeting the hon. member (Mr. Reynolds) I have come to the conclusion I would have enjoyed it much more if I had known him then. In that trip to Leeds, I had the great advantage of seeing "Old Man Ontario," eastern Ontario, which I had never seen before.

I would have liked it if the hon.member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) in his speech, had stressed more the agricultural end of his riding and not the good works of the government.

During the trip to Leeds I had the privilege of travelling through a couple of townships and also attending an auction sale

in Leeds County. This was typical to me as a farmer and I consider that thehon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) has stillsome work to do in the agricultural end of his riding, as well as the rest of us. His riding is much like my old riding in the County of Bruce and throughout the length and breadth of it is an agricultural county. We depend onthe agricultural industry, rural and urban alike.

At this point, I wouldjust like to say a word to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). As the previous speaker has said, a Committee on Comservation has been set up in this province and I, along with the other hon. members, do not know what is in the Committee's report, but I am hoping for the best for the rural districts of the province of Ontario. This government has a great responsibility and I think there should be something done by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) towards that responsibility. Unlike the previous speaker, I will adopt a different attitude. He spoke of the desirability of the further settlement of agricultural lands in this old province of Ontario. That was my dream a few years back. Last year when I spoke in this House I spoke of vast areas of good farms, good buildings, that were lying idle today throughout my own county and I saw them throughout other counties during the summer. Today we have a situation that has arisen in agriculture that demands serious attention. Today, in the Dominion of Canada, in the province of Ontario, we have an agricultural industry that is supplying an over-supply of produce for the people of this country and without a market for it overseas. Are we going to ask the young men and women of this country to come back to eke out an existence? No more than that would it be if you cannot sell your product?

Now, the government, through advice, through its agricultural colleges, through the report I hope these gentlemen will bring in on conservation, through the testing of soil, thrugh the furtherance of our agricultural representatives and through other actions canhelp the agricultural industry in the province of Ontario. I do not stand here today advocating subsidies. I say that a subsidy when instituted should only be applied to that product . as long as the time necessary for the producers of that product to get out of that product and into some other necessary line of business.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOSTER: We, in this province, do not wish to go on and produce 7,000,000 pounds of butter surplus and have no place to sell it. On that particular point, I would like to point out to the hon. members of the House that we passed a Margarine Billin this House when we were in need of butter production. Today we have a surplus of butter in the Dominion of Canada and we stillhave that Act permitting margarine to be produced inthe province of Ontario. Th t, I submit, cannot go on. As I said before, margarine should have been permitted in this county only so long as it was not detrimental to the interests of a vital industry of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning from the Department of Agriculture and under the conservation committee I would like to say that there are some recommendations I am almost certain must emanate fromthat committee. There is that great question of erosion and I go back to my good, old riding of Bruce and that good, old Saugeen River whihh, until flood control, was one of the most dangerous and most destroying rivers inthe province of Ontario. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to a situation that

exists at the mouth of the Saugeen River. In the village of Southampton we have about 100 feet of one of the nicest beaches in the province of Ontario already washed away. Two dwellings have had to be removed and a large bridge belonging to the Department of Highways has become endangered and is being filled with stones to try to stopthe erosion and save the bridge. We have a whole street of provincial highway that has been blocked off and the Department of Highways is using as a provincial highway a back street in the town of Southampton. Now, this situation is becoming alarming and this municipality was so alarmed that they have taken it up with the Federal Department of Public Works who have a joint responsibility in this program of development. I have a copy of a letter received from the Federal hon. Minister of Public Works at Ottawa to the village of Southampton saying that they are willing to meet the engineers of this government at any time to try to settle the responsibilities and to try to meet the situation. I also know that the village is so interested it is willing to contribute a share of these responsibilities.

I would seriously draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to this situation that is arising there and I think in his good judgment he will see fit to correct it. I was very glad yesterday in listening to the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Phillips) speak on agriculture and the interest in Bruce and Grey County especially on hospitalization. I would say he know the health situation in this province of Ontario as well as any other man in this House and when he spoke of the Owen Sound hospital situ tion, I could not help but think how we in the old county of Bruce, in a neighboring county, had increased our hospitalizati n from two hospitals to five and I think the five

hospitals will eventually, under the present trend of expansion, become a charge onthe county of Bruce. We had increased them to help eliminate the very situation w ich is arising in the Owen Sound hospital and I think this situation exists throughout the province of Ontario. Needless to say, after all that work and sometimes not so much patients, we in the northern part of Bruce County are charged a 15% surcharge for the patients we send over there, pay patients that go into the Owen Sound hospital. This sort of thing I think the government should stop. I think if hospitalizati on is as big a thing as it is in the province of Ontario no one county should be charged a surcharge in crossing the borderline from ne hospital to another. I also hope that the government is looking around to find a new Minister of Health in the place of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) who is now so ill. I hope thehon. member for Grey North (Mr. Phillips) will be the man they find and I willhave the privilege of helping and working with him to reconstruct some of ourhealth problems in the northern part of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a moment on the question of health and welfare. We have in this province a fine Department of Welfare and one which I contend is capably administered.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOSTER: I could not help but think as I listened to the address of my good friend from York East (Miss MacPhail), one who has given a lifetime to public service, from her early years in life and today is spending her years in service in the welfare of those who are needy---I could not help but think of the problem that arose from her speech, and I would like t bring itout here, that is the ques-

tion of welfare, the grant to the aged people in the municipalities. I was glad to listen to my hon. friend this afternoon who spoke of a house of refuge and how pleased he was with the new set-up. I, being an old member of county councils, and one who serves on the House of Refuge committees, do not think the solution of this problem lies entirely with the extension and building of Houses of Refuge. There is a moral situation that must be contended with other than by sending the aged to institutions. I think the place for the older people is in their own home, that is the logical place for them to be kept for a long time yet. The municipality in securing that grant towards this condition must also be reimbursed to the extent of $20 a month. This is within the Act. This sort of thing is the very thing that many of the municipalities do not want to start because with their present taxation, they do not wish to assume this extra burden and everything is being done to send these people out of the municipality and congregate them in the House of Refuge.

I could not help but think the other day here when we were discussing money and pensions when someone said: "What did the pioneers of this country do for money?", the four lines written a few years ago to the pioneer of the old County of Bruce, which is applicable to every county:

"Progress paths that you helped to clear
"But today forgets about you,
"And the world rolls on without you,
"Sleep, old pioneer."

Today, Mr. Speaker, in this House we have responsibilities; we have young men returning from overseas; we have young men who have taken up farming as their vocation who are going to try and eke out their existence in agriculture, from the soil. We in this House have a responsibility to

perform, majorly this government. It is up to us to do our best to cooperate in the welfare of the citizens of the province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. ROBSON (Hastings, East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like, through you, to offer to Mr. Speaker, my compliments on the very fine manner in which he has conducted the affairs of this Assembly. I would like to add to the many hon. members who have spoken before me my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the debate on the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Reynolds; Mr. Leger). Even though they are two new members who have not been here very long, I feel that they are going to make a great contribution towards the debates and towards the legislation in this House. Also, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I do not want to allow this opportunity to pass of congratulating our new leader the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost). I think, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when we chose thehon. member for Victoria (Mr. Frost) as the . Prime Minister we were very fortunate. Already we have had symptoms and signs of "Old Man Ontario" having confidence in him as a leader. In the last two by-elections he has conducted he has been very, very successful, in spite of the opposition which was tremendous against him. In the legislation brought down in the House and passed and the legislation tha he has administered, he has done a very good job. I wonder at his very fine knowledge and his wisdom which seems to really radiate out from him and I hope some day it will go clear across the floor and possibly land in the opposite benches. He used this wisdom in choosing his Cabinet, men of such calibre as he has have helped a great deal in the administration of his legislation. I would like, for a few minutes, to say

a few things about the men whom he has picked for his different department heads.

We have on the end down there, the Hydro Commissioner (Mr. Challies) a man who sat in the opposition for a while. In fact, thehhon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has a group of men around him who sat for many years in opposition and gained a vast experience. You people on the other side can pay pay attention to that because I think when you sit in opposition for some time you must gain considerable experience. Unfortunately I have not had that privilege of sitting over there.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): You will get it.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Are you sure he ison the right end.

MR. ROBSON : I am pretty certain that the group over there are the only ones who think so, and sometimes I think they are just trying to fool themselves because I doubt if that is going to be possible. It will not happen for a good many years. The signs all point exactly the other way.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBSON: We are getting stronger and stronger. This government has the confidence of Old ManOntario as no other government in theprovince of Ont rio has ever had, and every hon.member in the House knows that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBSON: You cannot go around through the ridings without realizing that is a fact today and it is gaining impetus all the time. In the matter of hydro we all know what has happened in the last five or six years. Hydro has developed, especially as it affects my riding , as it affects all rural ridings, as no one in the province of Ontario thought it ever could. The rural people

were promised hydro back in 1943 by Mr. Drew and the Hydro Commissioner, whom Mr. Drew appointed and who is still the Hydro Commissioner (Mr. Challies), hasnot let them down. It has developed to such an extent---it has taken a terrific gain. We had shortages but we will keep up our power plans until we have taken care of these shortages to a far greater degree than the public ever thought we would be able to do. We are now consolidating and I think that is good business, consolidating the gains we have made.

Then, thehon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) chose his hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), a man whohad vast experience, before he ever came to this House, in municipal affairs. He is well qualified for the job he has shown in the way he has carried out the duties of his department. Municipal business is one of the biggest businesses in Ontario today and they need guidance. The guidance thehon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has given is certainly good guidance. True, all municipalities are not satisfied, but that issomething to be expected. They are not satisfied possibly with things he is doing but I am going to tell you, if you show me someone whom everyone is satisfied with, I will show you someone who is not doing anything to aid the province or the country or his community. When I hear unjust criticism at times, then I know that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is doing a good job.

Then, we have thehon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) another man who is qualified fothe job as no other hon. Minister of Highways for the province of Ontario has ever been. He was a municipal man and the year he was appointed Minister of Highways he waspresident of theOntario Good Roads Association and what better qualifications could a man have than that. He

had a good grounding and a thorough understanding of the needs for roads in the province of Ontario. The legislation he has given us and the administration of that legislation has been exceptionally good. Never before have I known of so much legislation in such a short time, and so good. With the money that has been available to him he has built roads where they are needed. In northern Ontario they had considerable roads built to places where it was necessary to develop the mines and develop the lumbering industry. That is a thing that isnecessary, the necessary roads first. He is joinging up all parts of the province ofOntario and withthe new things he hasundertaken to do now, it bids well for the province, the provincial road system in Ontario.

Then, we have the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), a man who has been outstanding as an agriculturist, a man who has done more the farmers, more to get the farmers organized, than any other hon. Minister of Agriculture we have ever had. Personally, being a farmer I owe him a great debt and my riding owes him a great debt. The results of his legislation, the resultsof what he is doing are not only showing up now but they are going to show up in the years to come; he is just starting. He has given a great deal of support to our junior farmers and, mind you, the junior farmers, Mr. Speaker, are our hope for agriculture in the future. These older men in agriculture have been so set in their own ways it ispretty hard to make them deviate from there but the young fellows who are being brought up and trained by our representatives and taken all around Ontarioand shown what others are doing are getting a very broad aspect of the situation. Agriculture has very little to fear in the future.

Then, we have another group of men who maybe did not have so much experience to begin with, but have been here for some

time.

There is our hon. Attorney-General and Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). Now, is there any of us who can say education hasnot made more progress in the last five years than it ever made in any five years in the history of Ontario. We people in the rural sections of Ontario especially realize the wonderful advantages we have been given by legislation passed here.

(Page G-12 follows)

Our boys and girls, when they pass their entrance, have a right, if we form a stronger district, to give them -- privilege, and rural municipalit are certainly taking advantage of that. They are given the same right today as the pupils in the cities and villages had, and is that not only right and proper, that they should have it? Some people say, "You are taking them to the city and taking them away from the farm." Today, farming requires some education. It is true, they may go to the towns and cities and to the high schools and collegiates, and get certain education which is not going to be of very much value to them when they go back on the farm, but that education is very, very necessary, Latin and so on, to develope the minds of these boys and girls, so they can assimilate and study and learn and think, and use good judgment and do the things in agriculture that are necessary.

Therefore, today, I want to compliment the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) for that fine thing.

We pass on, now, to some of those other hon. ministers who did not sit in opposition previous to becoming hon. ministers. We have the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), who, I believe, is recognized by the labour men now -- not by the heads of the labour unions, I would not go so far as to say that, but I will say he is recognized by the labour groups as possibly the man who has given them more very important, and better legislation, than has ever been given them before in the last few years.

MR. MILLARD: That is what you think.

MR. ROBSON: I expected some of the heads of the unions would not agree with me outwardly, but inwardly, Mr. Speaker, I still think they do.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBSON: They have better legislation here than any place else in the world.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear,

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBSON: And better opportunities, and we will say more about that later.

MR. MILLARD: A lot later.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What are they changing it for?

MR. ROBSON: We have heard plenty about that, but we have heard it from the wrong men. We gave heard it from the heads of the labour unions who, today, do not represent labour.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBSON: We know and you all know of many, many instances where we have had strikes with less than forty per cent, and in some cases, fifteen per cent to twenty per cent of the employees in the factories wanting to strike.

MR. DENNISON: Could my hon. friend (Mr. Robson) name one instance?

MR. ROBSON: I can name one in my own home town. You can name more than one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Name it. Why the silence? Name it. Is the hon. member (Mr. Robson) refusing to name the one? If so, he is admitting that he was bluffing.

MR. ROBSON: You know I am not bluffing, and I do not have to name it today, but you know there are plenty. One took place in Belleville not so long ago, where there were not that many wanting a strike.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What was the name of that one, may I ask?

MR. ROBSON: You know. You do not have to ask me.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is the hon. member (Mr. Robson) afraid

of being repudiated by the employers? Then name it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member (Mr. Robson) does not have to name it. I do not think any hon. member of this House can force another hon. member to answer a question. We want to be fair. There have been hon. members of the Opposition who have refused to answer questions, and there have been hon. members of the government who have refused to answer questions.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I entirely agree, Mr. Speaker. He does not have to answer, but failure to answer speaks for itself.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that cannot be so taken.

MR. ROBSON: Mr. Speaker, in passing on to the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow), we have in him and in his department a department that is doing a wonderful work for those who are less fortunate. I believe he feels he is willing to do everything to give these old people and those unfortunate people, all the privileges and all the monetary assistance, the financial assistance, that this province is able to give. I believe today we have reached the saturation point of the amount of assistance we are giving them. If, in the opinion of the government, the financial status of this province will stand, and our revenue will stand any greater assistance, I believe it will be given to them. In that regard, we were leaders.

Then, we have the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests -- Fish and Wild Life (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) who has done such a splendid job in his department. That was Wild Life.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Explain yourself.

(Take H follows)

Well, Mr. Speaker, a good many of the hon. members of this House took a trip with thehon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) who at the same time was Minister of Game and Wild Life.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBSON: And from what I learned on that trip, I do not think I will have to take back that statement. He has accomplished great things with our forests, in management, fire protection, and so on and that great natural resource in my opinion is being directed and not exploited, which we have heard so much about.

We have also some newer hon. members of the Cabinet with whom the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) has surrounded himself. The hon.Minister the Liquor Commissioner and Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) has a very tough job. I think we are all going to agree he has inherited a really tough job and has done a wonderful job in carrying it out and straightening it up and bringing about many reforms which were needed there.

Then we have the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger). I know in these days, with the terrific suburban growth and so on, we do need planning and those municipalities who need it have been given wonderful assistance by the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger). The housing scheme has been given a boost by him and I think, all in all, we must admit he has done a very splendid job.

Then we have the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) who has done a real good job. I do not know much about mining, we do not have too many minerals in my part of the country, but I find the people of northern Ontario are as satisfied, possibly, as it is able to satisfy the mining districts, by our hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell).

The hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) certainly has a big job, because Ontario has a lot to be proud of and a lot to publicize. He has given great impetus to the tourist trade of Ontario and we expect in the very near future it is going to be one of our big industries.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have not overlooked any of them.

MISS MACPHAIL (York East): You have not.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): What about the whip?

MR. ROBSON: I did want to pay my respects to each of those departments.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: What about the whip?

MR. ROBSON: He has not any spurs.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBSON: And I compliment the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) on having gathered around him such a splendid group of Ministers as he has, and from that must emanate good government.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make any apologies for taking up maybe another fifteen or twenty minutes, because I have not taken very much time in this House in the last seven Sessions I have been here, so I am going to ask tonight for a few more minutes to say something about agriculture as it pertains to my county and to eastern Ontario generally.

When you take into consideration that in the county of Hastings---you have been told something about it this afternoon by my hon. colleague the member for West Hastings (Mr. Sandercock)---only 20% of that very large county, or a little less than 20% is tillable. When we think of that in the terms of the 80% of certain counties in western Ontario and the 60% and 65% and none under 40%, hardly,

which are tillable elsewhere, you can see we in Eastern Ontario have problems which are much different from those of western Ontario.

When this earth of ours was formed, when Ontario was laid out, it seems that eastern Ontario especially was given hills, not mountains, but plenty of hills and plenty of rolling land. These hills are full of rocks and nature has, as time went by, caused it to be covered sparsely with dirt and soil and has grown some trees for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) to supervise. Then we have certain level portions, but in those level portions nature in her haste did not separate the stones from the dirt and we find that on those slopes and in those lower level spots, we have boulders and stones galore. Also we have many different kinds of land. Na ture did not take time to separate the land, but she threw them all in together so that we have clay, loam, gravel, sand, all within a very short space of each other.

That is what our forefathers found they had to contend with when they came to settle in eastern Ontario and it made very, very hardy men of them, because they worked hard and long hours. As they worked, they tried out certain different things they could grow there. In respect of livestock, they first tried beef cattle but they found because they had to walk long distances and so on they did not do very well. Some trieddairy cattle, some tried dual purpose, but finally they came to the conclusion the dairy cow was the cow which was adapted to this kind of country in eastern Ontario and Hastings County especially.

Along with the dairy cow went the hog industry because they found they had too much milk to be consumed as whole milk and they started to make butter. Then they found they

had too much butter and they went to making cheese and then when they made cheese they found that the whey from the cheese contained so much protein and so on, that, along with our barley and oats it made splendid bacon.

Then the women, in order to have a little pin money for themselves, kept a few hens to supply the household. Then they started to supply the nearest village, and the villages were a long way apart because the land was so sparsely populated and still is, and this industry grew and grew untilthey kept a great many hens.

Cheese was made in eastern Ontario and shipped to the World's Fair at Chicago many years ago. It got a lot of publicity there, mostof it when it fell through the floor. It weighed eleven tons, a big square block of cheddar cheese, and when they put it on the floor, next day they found it in the basement and had to raise it. That attracted a lot of attention and a buyer fromEngland purchased it and when they took it out of the building it had been kept in they had to have the police guide it up the street and stop traffic for it and so on. Finally it went to England and there attracted a lot more publicity and it was finally cut up and found to taste so well it created a great demand and right then we in eastern Ontario started to set up cheese factories. They sprung up all over eastern Ontario, these small cheese factories, and that started the cheese industry.

World War Number One gave the cheese industry and the hog industry a "shot in the arm." It was found to be very, very important to the fighting man, because cheese, a piece of which you have on your desks, comes from milk, which is a whole food. Milk is a whole food which will sustain the body, and cheese is a very, very cnncentrated product, easy to handle and easy to

ship in concentrated form. Therefore it was used during the First War and the trade was given an impetus and we went on from there and as the price soared better cheese factories were built and so on, and today we have a lot of money invested in cheese factories.

Then the Second World War came along and it was found when the nations of Europe were fighting and the men were not at home to raise food, there was a shortage of food and, Mr. Speaker, it was found to be just as necessary to have food sent over there as it was to have bullets and guns, consequently once again the farmers of Canada came into their own and it was found the farmers of eastern Ontario were producing the particular foods, cheese, bacon and eggs, that were most necessary.

They were so necessary that the government stepped in and bought our cheese from us, making a contract with England. They made a contract for our bacon. They took our eggs,--another whole food which contains everything necessary to stimulate the body---and they broke them and froze them and put them in small containers, so that they could put a lot of food in a small space, and shipped them to England.

They told us, the farmers of eastern Ontario, to produce more and that they would take all we could produce. We produced more, our price was set, we had nothing to say about it, and during thatperiod we could not cut our own cheese in our own factories to eat, because the Food Ministry at Ottawa, set up by the government there, was taking all our cheese to England---that is, all our best cheese. The fodder cheese which comes in the spring and fall, went in part on the domestic market.

The same thing happened with bacon. They took all our best bacon, all the A hogs that went from every plant

except the small plants which had a small quota during the war of maybe 50 or 60 hogs, they could have As or anything for domestic consumption, but in the case of Canada Packers and all the large plants, every carcass that was A and the best of the Bs went to England. Our domestic market was left with just the poorer cheese, the poorer bacon and so on.

As things went on, the price went up a little until in 1948 we got 30 cents, which was not enough, so this government, and this House saw fit to grant two cents a pound on all the cheese we produced. In 1949 that was taken from us, and we produced it for 30 cents, notwithstanding the fact it was costing us all the time more to produce, because boxes and so on were going up in price.

We were told if we would go on and produce we would be assured of our British markets. There were some among us as we organized who said we were doing something possibly not in our best interests. We had over-produced and built up our herds and were producing double what we had ever produced before and they said we had gone too far, but the government said: "No, we will establish a market in England that will be there forever, you are supplying them with food and they will not forget it. You willhave a market there, regardless of the rest of the world."

We entered 1949 with that assurance and we went on; at the end of 1949 our contracts were discontinued, and England suddenly said: "We have no dollars, we cannot make any more contracts."

(Take I follows)

But Ottawa did make a contract. The price of cheese, which was set at 30¢ at the factory, we suddenly found to be set at 25¢ at the seaboard, and it cost 1¼ ¢ to get the cheese to the seaboard.

Bacon which was set at 20 ¢ last year at the seaboard, was set at 28¢ at the seaboard this year. There we were, with a cut in our prices of our main products. It was the same with eggs. The three main products we produce were cut. We do produce some canned goods, which has developed in the last few years, but every year we have to have a price set for all canned goods, between the consumers and the producers. We know that for 1950 the price has not yet been set. Ottawa has been successful in lowering the price of cheese, in lowering the price of bacon, and getting away with it, and in lowering the price of eggs, and we knew that the canners would take their cue from that, and the price of canned goods would be lowered. When they got together, week before last, the canners sat pat, and the producers sat pat, and we have not a price yet. It has gone to arbitration, but we know what will happen.

The Dominion government has come to our rescue a little bit. They said they would subsidize our bacon at 3¢ a pound, and make the price of cheese 28¢ a pound at seaboard, which means a loss of 3¼¢ from last year. They said, "it will cost us $2,100,000. to subsidize the price of cheese, that is wrong; that is a terrible thing". The Toronto papers came out with headlines, "$2,100,000. Subsidies", and said the price of food was going down, and so on. On the 29th of December, the Telegram had two editorials, one saying that these subsidies put on goods

was a very dangerous thing, and that they had given us 3¢ on our products while we thought they should have given us 6¢.

Just at that time, it happened that we were notified that the C.N.R. had a deficit of $47,000,000., and right under the first editorial I have mentioned, was another editorial in the Telegram upholding the deficit, and giving the reasons for it, excusing it, and so on. $47,000,000. of our money was going to the C.N.R. to cover a deficit. Was not that a subsidy?

MR. MacLEOD: The Telegram is a good Tory paper.

MR. ROBSON: The Star was not any better; in fact, it was worse later on. You say that subsidies are wrong? What are you going to do about the C.N.R.? If you do not pay the $47,000,000., to the C.N.R., what will happen to it? You have to have the Canadian National Railway in Canada, because it is very important to the economy of this country, and apparently bacon is not so important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not as bad as it looks. We consumed in Canada before the war about 450 million pounds of bacon. Last year, in Canada, we consumed 900 million pounds of bacon, and all that Great Britain is asking for is about 80 million pounds. The price of the 80 million pounds is as establishing the price for the 900 million pounds we are consuming, as well as for what they consume in England. Then, all the government at Ottawa has to do is to subsidize the 80 million pounds, and then the other 900 million will be sustained, and they will give the farmers of the Dominion of Canada, if they subsidize to the extent of 3¢, and will give another 3¢, $27,000,000. on the 900 million

pounds of bacon. They will be paying $27,000,000. on one product alone, that is bacon; and cheese, a lesser amount, and canned goods a lesser amount, and when it is all taken out, when they pay the subsidy on 900 million pounds of bacon at 3¢, it will only cost them another $2,000,000., and for $4,500,000. in subsidies to bacon, they can put in the pockets of the farmers $40,000,000.

It is very fine to subsidize the C.N.R. to the tune of $47,000,000., where apparently the economy of the nation cannot stand subsidizing the farmers to the extent of $4,500,000. on bacon.

The same thing with cheese. If they would give us 3¢ a pound, it would cost very little, because all the cheese they would have to subsidize is the small amount of cheese which goes to England. That is only a very small portion. Possibly this year, we will produce 120,000,000 pounds of cheese, which equals 4.2 pounds per person, which is eaten in Canada. That only accounts for 50 million pounds, so we shall have the rest to send to England, and we would only have a subsidy on the amount that goes to England or overseas, to bring the price of the other up to where it should be.

Now, before the year is over, I hope by testing it and packaging it in a different way we will have the people of Canada eating eight pounds of cheese per person -- in 1950. And before long, we hope, with the help of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) who is giving us money, instead of two cents to build curing and storage space, we can hold our own cheese, and we do hope in another year or so to have the people of Canada eating every pound of Cheddar

cheese that is manufactured here. Then we will not need any subsidy. But subsidies, while they are not right, as the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Foster) just told you -- would tide us over and be perfectly legitimate. We are doing that with everything else. We are not subsidizing the textile industry, but really we are subsidizing every industry that is getting production, and they will continue to be subsidized, but the government at Ottawa knows it is only a matter of a year or so until they will not have to be subsidizing cheese, when the people of England will be coming and asking us for more cheese.

I say we should have more money. Perhaps not "more money", but we should have as much, yet we are getting less, in the face of rising costs of everything we are buying on the farm. The cost of everything is rising. A Ford tractor which in 1947 cost $1,030., today is at least $1,500., and before spring comes, as soon as we feel the effect of the $100. a month pension to the steel-workers, the cost will likely be $1,600.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Does the hon. member (Mr.Robson) think the $9,000,000. profit of Massey-Harris had anything to do with these tractor prices?

MR. ROBSON: I am a farmer, and I do not know anything about the intricate workings of the companies, but I notice every time wages are up, or social services, up goes the price of a plough-share, and up goes the price of every implement we buy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: The profits also go higher.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBSON: I would like to just make another little comment in that regard. The product of our cheese is better than it has ever been before. We are even taking the extraneous matter out of it, which is something we never did before. We never did, when we sent it to England, but now we are sending some of it to the United States, and there is some extraneous matter in it, which they do not like. They do not know it is there, but their inspectors find it, and we are taking it out. It all costs money. We have to improve the quality of our bacon, we have to improve the quality of our eggs, we have the improve the quality of our butter, and we have to improve the quality of every thing we produce on the farm -- we have had to raise the standards.

What about the quality of the things we buy? We would not mind paying exorbitant prices if the things we buy were anything like they were five years ago, everything from a suit of clothes to a plough-share. The plough-shares now are thinner, and they break easily. The machinery we buy goes to pieces so quickly it is not funny. The cost of repairs is terrific. There is nothing we buy, from a sap bucket to a milk pail, that we are sure will hold together I bought some recently, and hung them on the trees, and they began to lead before they ever held any sap. Why is that? Why is it that the quality of the things we buy is not good?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): That is the hon. Minister of Labour's (Mr. Daley) free enterprise system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBSON: It is somebody's fault. We do not go down to the plant and look them over, but we suspect that these shorter hours and bigger pay and wages, and the activities

of the agitation by certain organizers does not help very much.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Do you think it would help the farmers, if wages went down?

MR. ROBSON: No, because then the men would not come to work on the farms, because we cannot have a 40-hour week on the farm. We work a lot longer time than that. It would not affect our products. It only affects the products we buy, those are the things which we notice are affected. We had a coal strike recently, and what happened to the price of coal? I do not know what made it go up. It did not stay where it was. The fellow who handles the coal wants more money. It is gone up for us.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I will say this for the farmers of Ontario, that if we do not get comparable prices, we will be reduced to the peasant class where we were once. Mr. Speaker, we have been hewers of wood and drawers of water for big industry for a good many years --

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Now you are talking.

MR. DENNISON: What about your campaign funds?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBSON: Has Labour got such a hold on the farmers, that they will make us hewers of wood and drawers of water for industry, and the big interests, and Labour, too? That is what it is coming to.

MR. MacLEOD: You are spoiling a good speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Keep going; you are"getting their goats".

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBSON: We have an organization, Mr. Speaker,--

MR. PARK: You have the check-off, too.

MR. ROBSON: We have everything now that you have. And that organization will begin to function, Mr.Speaker, If the coal miners can endanger the lives of the people of a nation, as big as the United States, and put her right on her knees, as they did a few weeks ago -- when they are bold enough to do that, is it impossible, if we are going to be reduced to the peasant class, that sometime, with the organization we have, it might not be dangerous? After all, the farmers might throw away their milk-stools.

The economy of this nation can well afford to pay these few dollars in subsidies, and they can ill afford not to, because when you upset the economy, it is going to be upset, that is all, unless something happens, which is not the farmers' fault. We had nothing to do with the dollar situation. We do not know who had, but somebody did, and it developed all at once, but we are the ones who are affected by it. It looks as if we are going to take 20 percent. less for our products and pay 20 percent. more for what we buy next summer.

If the economy of any group of people like the farmers can stand that, they are a pretty sturdy people.

Why do I bring it here? You say it is not our baby? Mr. Speaker, I see I have just about three minutes --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

MR. ROBSON: That is not Ontario's baby. When I walk down the street, and see a baby on somebody's doorstep, it is not my baby --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBSON: We have a system here where we look after those babies, or we see they are looked after. We do not leave them there to die.

MR. MacLEOD: You should tell that to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost).

MR. ROBSON: This situation is not our baby.

MR. MacLEOD: How about the unemployed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBSON: I think we should all have the interest of agriculture in Ontario at heart.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, and that it do stand adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR. E. B.JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Before the motion is put, I take it, it is the intention to bring the present debate to a conclusion tomorrow?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And that, I presume, will mean that most of the time will have to be devoted to this debate. May I take it, in other words, that we will be going on with this debate quite soon after the House resumes tomorrow?

MR. FROST: There are three speakers, I think, the concluding speakers for each of the parties. We will proceed with them at once. It is our hope we may be able to proceed with some Bills, following the debate. I had in

mind perhaps calling the Marriage Act, and there are a number of other matters which perhaps we can clear up tomorrow afternoon, that is, following the conclusion of the addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne, assuming, of course, that the government is sustained on this motion.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, may I ask one question? Has the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) given any consideration at all as to when he will give the private hon. members of the House a "break"? We have a lot of business on the Order Paper, and would like a chance sometime to discuss these Bills.

MR. FROST: I will discuss that matter with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). In fact, I sent him a note this afternoon about the matter.

The private members' Bills we have here are many in number. I had hoped this year there would be less of them, but there are a great many. That is an innovation which has arisen in the last few years in the proceedings of this House, Introducing a multitude of Bills of that sort is not according to the old, accepted practice in the House. Our procedure in this House was never set up to deal with a situation such as that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to leave Bills on the Order Paper. I would prefer to clear them off. On the other hand, I must say it does seem to me a rather foolish procedure to go through these Bills one after the other, and vote them down. I do not think that is really good parliamentary practice. However, I will endeavour to discuss that with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) tomorrow.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House.

MR. FROST: Perhaps we might listen to what the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) has to say.

MR. MacLEOD: I want to say this. It may be true that the introduction of these Bills is out of line with earlier practices in this House, but I would remind the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that several years ago we set up a Select Committee to consider the rules of the House, and that committee brought in a report, and one of the recommendations of that committee was that one day a week during the Session should be set aside for the consideration of private members' Bills, but nothing was ever done about it. That was in the report of the Select Committee on the Rules of the House.

MR. FROST: I will get that report and read it, but we have not had much opportunity to set aside any time so far, as we have been busy each and every day in connection with the work of the House.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I often wonder why the hon. members do not raise the points more in debate. There has been plenty of opportunity in the debates, and these questions could have been raised then, instead of putting them on the Order Paper in this form.

At Ottawa, the practice is to have certain private members days which get less and less as the Session progresses, until perhaps only half an hour is given to a Bill, and if it does not reach finality at that time, it goes to the bottom of the list, and is forgotten. It may be, if we are going to have a multitude of Bills such as this,

we will have to adopt some similar practice.

However, I will try and discuss the matter with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) tomorrow, and perhaps we can form a coalition on this.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:06 o'clock p.m.

- - - - -